

freedom of speech and of the press and opposing House bill 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of G. W. Paulus, John A. Gaynor, and others, of Grand Rapids, Wis., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of J. C. Noonan, Miss M. T. Murphy, Miss C. I. Farrell, and 97 other Roman Catholic citizens, of New York City, against use of the mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Murphy, Washington, D. C., favoring a bill placing on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of major general, Col. John L. Clem, Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York associated dailies against increase in postage rate on newspapers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of harbor boatmen of New York, favoring passage of seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of E. R. Davis and Norman King, of New York City, against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COPLEY: Memorial of St. Joseph's Branch, No. 67, Western Catholic Union, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Northern San Joaquin County, Cal., against legislation prohibiting manufacture by the Government of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 32 citizens of Herington and Lehigh, Kans., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Miss Mary S. Burroughs, chairman, and 6,000 citizens in a mass meeting at Elmwood Music Hall, Buffalo, N. Y., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of Baxter County, Ark., for the completion of the system of locks and dams on the upper White River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers to accompany H. R. 21061, granting an increase of pension to William R. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., and citizens of Jamaica Plain and Boston, Mass., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petitions of citizens of Elgin, Linton, and Gladstone, Lidgewood, Newhome, Sykeston, Hankinson, and Richardton, N. Dak., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 40 citizens of Kindred, N. Dak., in the interest of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Women's Club, of Green Bay, Wis., favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of the ninth congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Groton, Conn., favoring an appropriation to be used to make copies of certain historical data now on file in the Pension Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petitions of Vorwaerts Singing Society, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; German Roman Catholic Central Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa.; and E. C. F. Ernst, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of E. C. Keyser, of Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to system of Federal, State, and municipal free-employment agencies; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Simpson, Brown & Williams, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against House bill 16098, relative to registration of trade-marks; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, memorial of Woman's Home Missionary Society, Oakland Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting

against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of chamber of commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against House bill 18666, ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Frankford Arsenal Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to appropriation for improvements in Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Lutheran Mutual Fire Insurance Association, Burlington, Iowa, relative to exempting from bill to compel companies doing business in a State to pay taxes there on mutual insurance within church organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Papers to accompany House bill 20389; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petition of Legislature of Arkansas, favoring completion of a system of locks and dams begun in 1898; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of citizens of Easton, Pa., protesting against abridgment of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of 48 citizens of New Salem, Ill., and 34 citizens of Bluffs, Ill., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens and societies of Connecticut, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Art Ring, of Long Branch, N. J., favoring establishment of municipal free-employment agencies; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Big Sandy, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions signed by 1,200 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions signed by 41 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 344, authorizing a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions signed by six citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Palmer-Owen child labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial of common council of the city of Utica, N. Y., favoring the pensioning of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of Vienna, N. Y., protesting against Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 16, 1915.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 15, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Borah	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Goff	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Gore	Overman	Smoot
Bristow	Gronna	Page	Stephenson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Penrose	Sterling
Burleigh	Hollis	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	James	Pittman	Swanson
Camden	Johnson	Pomerene	Thomas
Catron	Jones	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	Kenyon	Robinson	Townsend
Clapp	Kern	Root	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Saulsbury	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Shaftroft	Warren
Cole	Lodge	Sheppard	Weeks
Crawford	McCumber	Sherman	White
Culberson	McLean	Shively	Williams
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent to submit a report.

Mr. CULBERSON. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The bill reported will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 7545) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Worth, Tex., and for the remodeling, altering, and so forth, of the present post-office building, reports it without amendment and submits a report (No. 986) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas offered the report before I objected, but I have no objection now to its being made, as it has already been reported, but I shall object to any further morning business.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, what is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any; it is all over. The request was for leave to submit a report, and the report has been received and the bill has gone to the calendar.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415). The committee is now considering the appropriation bill, and I should like to have it go to the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I shall object to any morning business being received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah if he will object to a report of the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. GORE. I was asking whether the Senator would feel obliged, under his statement, to object to the report of the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the bill is ready to be reported?

Mr. GORE. Not yet. The report is being written now. I had intended to have it ready this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator I will wait until that time arrives, and then I will see.

#### PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, yesterday the Chair honored me with an appointment on the special committee to investigate certain shipping matters. It is extremely inconvenient for me to serve on that committee, and I ask to be excused.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senate excuse the Senator from Massachusetts? Consent is given. The Chair appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] in place of the Senator from Massachusetts.

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. REED to amend Rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to lay the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] on the table.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa stated to me last evening that he desired to address the Senate upon his amendment for 15 or 20 minutes. If I can do so, with the general understanding that I shall have the privilege of the floor to renew my motion immediately upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa, I will withdraw the motion. Otherwise, I will let it stand. I, of course, desire to give the Senator from Iowa a fair opportunity to present his motion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I could not quite hear the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. None of us can hear as long as the business of the Senate is being transacted between individual Senators on the floor, and 15 or 20 are talking at the same time. I made this statement, that the Senator from Iowa had last evening said to me that he desired 15 or 20 minutes to present his motion or resolution to the Senate, and that his opportunity would be cut off if I insisted on my motion to lay on the table. I am willing to withdraw my motion to lay on the table if by general consent I shall be entitled to the privilege of the floor to renew it as soon as the Senator from Iowa concludes his remarks.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that when the Senator from Iowa concludes I may want to occupy the floor for a few moments.

Mr. REED. On that same question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. REED. Well, I will include the Senator's speech in my request. I am not asking the Senate to formally agree; I only mean to arrive at a general understanding which will be observed as a matter of good faith. I expect to renew the motion, if I withdraw it, as soon as these two Senators have concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, there may be other Senators who may want to be heard on this same motion. It seems to me that it is a little unusual for a Senator to hold the Senate and allow certain Senators to speak and ask them to close debate at that time.

Mr. REED. It seemed to me that courtesy might well be accorded to the Senator from Iowa, but if I can not have the understanding that I will be permitted to have the floor I will not withdraw the motion.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I shall not object, but there is no understanding, so far as I am concerned, that any Senator can yield the floor and then retake it at any time it suits his convenience.

Mr. REED. I will leave it to the honor of the Senate, and I will take the liberty of withdrawing the motion.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not want it understood that my honor is involved in this. If I want to speak and can get the floor, I will speak on this or any other motion, regardless of the wishes of the Senator from Missouri or anybody else; that is, if I can get the recognition of the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is it possible for the Senate by unanimous consent to agree that the presiding officer of the Senate shall recognize the Senator from Missouri at a specified time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate can not take away from the presiding officer the right to recognize a Senator.

Mr. REED. I shall ask for recognition immediately after the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] shall have concluded his remarks, if he gets the floor after the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can a Senator retain the floor, even by unanimous consent, under the condition and under the motion now pending by the Senator from Missouri?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to lay on the table, of course, is not debatable. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. REED. I was simply desirous of according a courtesy to the Senator from Iowa, but it is perfectly manifest that the Senators on his side of the Chamber do not want that courtesy extended.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire, of course, to say a few words in regard to the amendment I have proposed, but I shall not detain the Senate for a very great length of time—not over half an hour. However, I have no authority to speak for anyone else, and I do not want any courtesy extended to me to bind anybody else.

Mr. REED. The Senator says he does not want any courtesy extended to him?

Mr. CUMMINS. I said while I would be very glad to have the courtesy extended to me, yet I did not want that courtesy, which I assumed was personal largely, to draw any other Senator into its operation. I can not speak for other Senators upon the floor, and I do not intend to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will take the chances on getting the floor, and I will withdraw the motion in order that the Senator from Iowa may make his remarks.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the question of cloture in the Senate is one upon which I think honest men can differ. I know that there are a great many reasons for preserving unlimited debate in this body, and I have been very much impressed—Mr. President, I should like to have order.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, we can not hear anything the Senator from Iowa is saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has decided a great many times that it is a self-governing body.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CATRON. This amendment, I understand, has not been printed. I suggest that it be read before the Senator proceeds with his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].



The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] proposes the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the substitute, the following:

"This rule shall not apply to any bill, motion, resolution, or question upon which Senators belonging to any political party have held a caucus and passed a resolution or declaration in any form attempting to bind the members of such party in the Senate to vote in any particular way and where the application of the rule is moved by a Senator belonging to any such political party."

"The fact respecting the existence of such caucus, resolution, or declaration shall be determined in the first instance by a committee of five Senators appointed by the presiding officer, who shall report within two days, and upon its report by the Senate without debate."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, as I was just observing, there is room for a very wide difference of opinion with regard to the propriety or wisdom of imposing a cloture upon the deliberations or debates of the Senate.

I have given due heed, I think, to the arguments for and against the limitation of debate, and without entering into the reasons which have influenced me, I desire to say that in my opinion, the weight of the argument is in favor of a limitation of debate in the Senate. When I say that, I am not to be understood as saying that I believe the majority of the Senate should at any time have the power to absolutely foreclose further debate, but I do think that a proportion of the Senate—I have not reached a definite conclusion upon that point, whether it should be a majority or whether two-thirds of the Senate—ought to have the power to put into effect a rule which will automatically close debate after a reasonable time, after every Senator has had an opportunity to reasonably discuss the question before the body.

There are, however, two conditions which ought to be excluded from the operation of any such rule. There are two conditions against which a filibuster, so called, is not only justified but, I think, imperatively demanded. Whenever the Chief Executive of the country attempts to impose his will upon the Senate, and thus to preclude or prevent that fair and open mind to which all discussion ought to be directed, when Senators do not feel that they are at liberty to vote upon a particular measure in any way which their judgment and their conscience direct them to vote, then a rebellion in the form of a filibuster is not only justified but, I think, it is absolutely required if we would preserve the freedom and the dignity of the Senate of the United States. I recognize, however, that there is no practicable way in which the existence of that fact or that condition can be shown. I do not know of any method through which proof could be offered of that fact. Therefore I pass it without further consideration.

But there is another condition, Mr. President, which justifies a political minority in prolonging debate to the uttermost limit of their strength. That condition is a caucus held by Senators which, under a rule adopted by some political organization, binds or attempts to bind all Senators belonging to that political organization to vote in a particular manner. I have already many times expressed my opinion with regard to the practice of a caucus; I have expressed it with regard to the party of which I am a member as emphatically and as indignantly as I express it now with regard to my friends upon the other side of the Chamber. I think that a caucus held by any political party with respect to legislation that is intended to have for its effect the foreclosing of a matter under debate, that is intended to have for its effect the subversion of the judgment and the conscience of Members of the Senate, is not only intolerable in a free country but that it ought to be made unlawful.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if that was his opinion when he was governor of the great State of Iowa?

Mr. CUMMINS. It was. It was not only my opinion but it was publicly expressed and continually insisted upon. I was once a member of the Legislature of Iowa, and I absolutely declined to enter a legislative caucus for the purpose of determining the attitude of the members of the party to which I belonged upon a legislative matter that was then pending before the general assembly. In all my life I never entered a caucus upon any such subject, and I have always denounced it, just as I am denouncing it now.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If I am in error, of course I want to be corrected; but my recollection is that the Senator from Iowa, for the purpose of accomplishing a number of very much needed reforms in his State, which were accomplished by him, held a

good many conferences and meetings with the majority members of the legislature, to the end that a common purpose and concerted action might be established, and was established, without which his reforms would have been impossible.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, during the seven years I was governor of the State of Iowa there was not a single caucus upon legislation held by the members of the general assembly of that State by either party. Long ago it became disreputable in the State of Iowa for any political party or the members of any political party organization in the general assembly to hold a secret caucus and endeavor in that way to bind the members of the body to any particular course upon legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator seems to overlook the fact that, out of regard for his feelings, I used the word "conference."

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, there is a vast difference between a caucus and a conference. It is true that a conference may be just as vicious as a caucus; it makes no difference what name is used. The vital thing is what transpires at the conference or the caucus. I have no objection, and no one could have objection, to members of a body who are of the same general mind meeting together and discussing the merits of legislation or the merits of any proposal, whether it be legislation or no. That is not the point I am endeavoring to make.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has referred to a time when I was governor of Iowa, I will say that I know of a good many conferences held during the legislative sessions of those years. Those conferences were not political. Men of both political parties joined in the conferences. I think I know the fact sufficiently well to state it without any qualification, that in no conference ever held in my State during the time I was governor was there even a suggestion that any man who attended such conference felt under the slightest obligation as he passed out of it to do any particular thing.

We have here, though, a case—and I have seen it before—in which 35 or 36 members of a political party met together and acted under a rule which was adopted in 1903, a rule which definitely and specifically declares that when two-thirds of the members of that party vote in favor of a particular question in caucus, the action of the caucus becomes binding upon every member of that political organization, with two or three exceptions which I shall not attempt to repeat, because all Senators will remember the discussion of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] a few days ago, in which he read and commented upon the exceptions to the rule.

I am not attempting, and I beg you will not believe that I am attempting, to disparage the political organization which now constitutes the majority in this Senate, for what I am saying has been applicable at times just as fully and completely to the party to which I belong as it is now applicable to the party upon the other side of the Chamber.

It seems to me that as free men, independent men, as patriots, as men who have been intrusted with great power to be employed for the good of all the people, we ought to be able to discuss such a question as this without any partisan bias.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa permit me to interrupt him for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Iowa has just said in effect that his argument would apply at times in the past to the party to which he belongs. I should like to say to the Senator from Iowa that in my service in the House of Representatives and here, covering nearly 14 years, I never have known of a binding caucus being held in either House on the part of the Republican Members. I have attended many conferences, but I have always gone out from those conferences with a perfect understanding that I was free to vote as I pleased.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I did not refer in what I said to the action of Republican Members of Congress.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do know, however, that Republican members of other legislative bodies have been in caucus and have done precisely what was a short while ago done by the Democratic Members of the Senate. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I would go further than the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and remind the Senator from Iowa that at least in my experience of nearly 18 years in this body I do not recall any conference or any caucus on matters of legislation, whereas under the present régime we have witnessed caucuses prolonged for a week, surrounded by great mystery and secrecy, binding the members under a two-



thirds rule, and then presenting legislation to this body with a notice that it must be passed by sessions held from early in the morning until late at night, without deliberation or the privilege of studying it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will understand that I am not speaking of any recent action, or possibly remote action—I know nothing of that—on the part of the Republicans in Congress. I only know that there have been times and places in which the Republican Party has held caucuses and has attempted to bind its members to vote in a particular way. I know it, because I refused absolutely to enter a caucus of that kind when I was a member of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa. But I am not referring at all to what has been done here. I know that the practice has been abolished here in our party, anyhow. I am simply attempting to show that this is a course which has not been peculiar to any one political organization; but it is just as bad though it has been practiced by all the political organizations of the country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to say, Mr. President, that during the period of time covered by the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania the Republican majority generally took its orders from and acted by the direction of one man.

Mr. PENROSE. The Democrats are doing that now.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. I understand perfectly what the Senator from Colorado has in his mind, and I know that there was a time when one man, a leader in the Senate, had very great influence. However, as much as I deprecated that influence and as widely as I differed from the man who exercised it, he never had the temerity to call his associates together and attempt by the passage of a resolution to bind them to vote in a particular way. I have been in the Senate now six years, and more, and I have never even been invited to attend a conference of Republicans that had for its purpose the determination of the manner in which Republican Senators should vote upon any measure of legislation or anything that was incident to it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to say at this point of the very interesting observations which the Senator is making that the secret caucus is not more distasteful to the people of his State, those of any other State, or to the people anywhere on earth, than it is to the honest white Democrats of the State of which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor. I do not believe a man running for the legislature in Mississippi could carry a single supervisor's district if he announced that he would be bound by a secret caucus in casting his vote on any question that might come before the legislature. Mississippi had a very notorious experience with the secret caucus in 1910.

The secret caucus is responsible for one of the blackest, most disgraceful, and dirty pages in the history of that great Commonwealth. No self-respecting Mississippian can look back upon that unfortunate period without the blush of shame mantling his or her cheek; but, thank God, the stain has been wiped from the fair name of the State, in so far as it could be effaced by the action of the people. Their first opportunity came in 1911 at the primary election which nominated me for a seat in this Chamber. A more complete, thorough, overwhelming repudiation of the advocates and champions of the secret caucus it is not possible for a people to make, and the system of the secret caucus was denounced, spat upon, by the voters at the polls in a manner which admit of no doubtful interpretation. I am so thoroughly impressed with the iniquity of the system that I am loath to enter into any sort of agreement or understanding that could be construed as consenting on my part to be bound by the vote of any man or any set of men to control my vote on any measure of public importance, especially, Mr. President, if the understanding and caucus action shall be entered into behind closed doors. I feel that I have been instructed by the people of my State to oppose in every honorable and proper way the methods of the secret caucus. I believe that legislation enacted by such methods can not be the voluntary enactment into law of the best judgment of the servants of the people, and therefore it must of necessity be pernicious.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield to any Senator, but it must be understood that I yield only for a question, and not under circumstances that would take me from the floor, because I feel that I must observe in good faith—and I will observe in good faith—to the implied understanding between the Senator from Missouri and myself when he withdrew his motion to lay my amendment upon the table.

Mr. President, I thought that the advancing civilization of this country, I thought that the influence of the progressive movement upon this country, had annihilated the caucus. I am not now speaking of the progressive movement in the Republican Party any more than I am speaking of the progressive movement in the Democratic Party, or the progressive movement as shown in the organization of a third party; I am speaking of the general advance in political thought; I am speaking of the consensus of opinion, which I think is universal, that in these days men who come into a legislative body to serve the people must be free men, and must be at liberty to vote at all times so that the interests of the country shall be promoted.

I was astonished more than I could well express when the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] a few days ago rose and read from the record of the caucus of 1903 a formal resolution which, by its very terms, attempted to bind one-third of the members of the Democratic organization to any measure upon which two-thirds could agree. I assumed, even in the palmy days of the caucus, even when there was no public opinion challenging the caucus as there is now, that the effect of the caucus would be rather implied than expressed. I assumed that the action of the members of the caucus or the party was dependent rather upon their sense of honor than upon their express obligation entered into formally in the way of a written contract to do a particular thing; and I believe the country was astonished when the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] laid before it the resolution upon which he relied to coerce one-third of the Democratic Members of this body into action favorable to the pending measure.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I should like to have the Senator tell me when I introduced a resolution in the Senate to coerce one-third of the Democratic Senators or to coerce anybody else.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was speaking of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I referred specifically to the senior Senator from Missouri. The junior Senator from Missouri will remember that a few days ago his colleague rose and read a resolution of the Democratic caucus held in 1903, and then recited what had occurred at a recent Democratic caucus respecting this bill, and thereupon he declared—I shall not attempt to quote it—that every Democratic Member in this body was bound by the resolution passed a few weeks ago to support this measure.

Mr. REED. Oh, well, that is a very different statement than I understood the Senator to be making. I deem it entirely unnecessary to make further reply.

Mr. CUMMINS. I appeal to those who are about me either to verify or to overthrow my recollection of that remarkable address; but I am not mistaken when I say that the senior Senator from Missouri read a resolution of 1903, which expressly declared that whenever two-thirds of the Members on the Democratic side of the Chamber united in a particular course, then every Democratic Member was bound to pursue that course unless it involved the Constitution of the United States, or some pledge that he had made to his constituents, or—there was one other exception which I do not now recall.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask that before the Senator takes his seat he will give the Senate the benefit of his views upon filibustering as well as upon the caucus.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will do it. I said in the very beginning that I do not believe in the filibuster simply because of difference of opinion. I believe that where there is in any body a free and fair debate, where every mind is open and at liberty to reach the conclusion which the conscience behind the mind directs, when the question has been fairly debated, when the period of instructive debate ceases, the vote should be taken. I believe in the rule of a majority. I stated that with candor, I think, and with emphasis. But now, in order that there shall be no dispute about what the resolution was to which I referred,



I read it from the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. This resolution was passed on the 15th day of December, 1903:

*Resolved*, That hereafter all members of the Senate Democratic caucus shall be bound to vote in accordance with its decision made by a two-thirds vote of all its members upon all questions except those involving a construction of the Constitution or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents or received instructions from the legislature of the State which he represents.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire to interrogate me?

Mr. WEEKS. I desire to ask a question, Mr. President, namely, whether the Senator from Iowa has appreciated the extreme measures which might be taken by a caucus. For instance, I am informed that at a caucus held at the other end of the Capitol last night a resolution was passed, and has been reported to the House to-day, under which the previous question is to be ordered without debate on a proposal to prevent amendments and pass a bill after six hours' debate, which would mean about 40 seconds to each Member.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, as I view it, there is no way of exaggerating or unduly emphasizing the wrong of a course of that kind. If two-thirds of a caucus can bind the Members to one thing, it can bind them to another. There is no limit to its power; and if two-thirds of the Democratic Members of this body can compel unison of action between the Democratic Members, then there is no legislative body. The Senate of the United States has ceased to exist, just exactly as the House of Representatives has ceased to exist as a deliberative body. It is controlled in all great measures by the caucus of the prevailing party. But I recall Senators to the language I have just read:

That hereafter all members of the Senate Democratic caucus shall be bound to vote—

Such a surrender of manhood, such an abdication of responsibility, such an utter disregard of the oath which every man takes when he enters this body, I have never before known; and I desire to say this much for my Democratic friends: I do not believe they would pass such a resolution now. I do not believe they would dare to do it; but there has been revived a resolution which savors of medieval tyranny in order to facilitate and speed the progress of this measure. I appeal to every Senator who believes that he is progressive, who is willing to march along the path toward better legislation and toward greater responsibility, to pause when he considers the resolution under which our Democratic friends are now acting.

I repeat that if there is a fair field for debate I think there should be in the power of the Senate a limitation upon debate, for I have too much confidence in my fellow Senators, without regard to their political affiliations, to believe that a measure, after being fully discussed, could be passed which would inflict great injury upon the country of which we are all citizens. But what has been done, so far from giving the majority a right to determine what legislation we shall enact, the caucus has conferred upon a minority the right to determine the character of our legislation. It may not be so in this particular instance, because seven members of the Democratic organization have refused to be bound by this rule; but assuming that they were all bound, assuming that the 16 members of the Democratic part of the Senate were opposed to this bill and were bound to vote for it because 36 members of their organization have declared that it was legislation that ought to be passed, what, then, is the spectacle presented to the American people? Instead of requiring 49 Members of the Senate to pass a law, 36 Members of the Senate have passed a law; and against that usurpation on the part of a minority there is no extent of filibuster that is not justified and defensible.

There has never been a moment of real debate in this Chamber upon the bill now before us, because real debate involves a mind that is willing to listen, involves the opportunity at least for conviction and for change of opinion. Since the action of the caucus, so far as those who have regarded themselves as bound by it are concerned, there has never been an hour in which any discussion of the question would avail those who were participating in it. I do not know how many of these Members are in fact opposed to this measure. I do not know that. I do not propose to say. I only say that we are operating under a rule of the caucus which enabled or is intended to allow 36 members of the caucus to control the action of 53 members.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. REED. What does the Senator think about, say, five or six long-winded gentlemen by a mere filibuster controlling not

only the action of one side of the Chamber but the action of both sides? Does he think that is less objectionable than it is for a party to assume responsibility as a party?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I answer the question in this way: If the seven Members to whom the Senator from Missouri refers—

Mr. REED. I am not referring to any particular seven Members. I am stating a situation. Under the present rule, four or five able-bodied physical orators can absolutely stop the entire business of the country by merely standing on the floor and pouring out a ceaseless stream of talk. I ask the Senator if he thinks that is to be preferred over caucus action?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think they are both thoroughly indefensible.

Mr. REED. I ask if that does not present a case where 6 men control the business of the country instead of 40 or 50, against which the Senator inveighs?

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, sometimes a minority must rebel. There have been occasions when it was necessary for a minority to fight, and fight hard. There are a great many instances of that in the history of the world. If it were not so, Darius would have occupied Greece, and the Saracens would have overrun Europe and given us Mohammed and the Koran instead of Christ and the Bible.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, all minority rebellions are not just. A minority may rebel in a bad cause. Since the Senator from Iowa has gone into historical lore I might cite him to the rebellion of one Judas Iscariot and to a somewhat later rebellion by an individual known as Benedict Arnold. Both of these gentlemen were in the minority, but the fact that they were in the minority did not put any virtue into their infamous acts. So minorities may be wrong as well as majorities.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. REED. And since the Senator has said that there comes a time when a minority may rebel against the tyranny of a majority, it occurs to me that the time has now arrived when a majority may well rebel against the tyranny of a minority.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is not happy in his reference to Judas Iscariot, for reasons which I shall not develop just now; but from my standpoint a minority has a right to fight if it has no opportunity to speak. I have said many times that if the minority had a chance to convince the individual Members of the Senate through the force or the merit of their argument in my humble judgment the attempt to prevent a vote after fair discussion had ensued can not be justified; but if they enter the contest knowing that the minority of the Senate has held a caucus and has bound enough Members to constitute in the whole a majority, then it would seem to me that any course that would prevent the success of the caucus action and the overthrow of individual judgment and conscience would be right.

Mr. REED. Even though the men who entered into that effort to destroy the caucus action had themselves made an agreement so hard and fast that by force thereof they were holding Members to vote against their judgment and their will? Does the Senator think that is proper? The Senator knows that is exactly the situation in the Senate at the present hour. He knows that the Republican Members held a meeting—whether or not they met all together in one room is immaterial—and they arrived at an absolute agreement to vote to recommit the present bill. He knows that every Member upon that side of the Chamber except two men were drawn into that agreement. He knows that the Republican representatives and seven Democrats all finally united in the agreement. If he does not know the fact, I can tell him that a number of Senators on a number of votes have said that they did not like to vote as they did, but that they were in honor bound by their agreement to so vote because they had pledged themselves to vote to recommit this bill, and that they could not break away from their agreement. I want to ask the Senator if he does not call that sort of agreement a caucus?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to rise to a question of personal privilege. The Senator from Missouri has made a statement which he says the Senator from Iowa knows and every Senator on this side knows. I challenge the truthfulness of that statement, so far as the Senator from Wyoming is concerned. The Senator from Wyoming neither directly nor indirectly has agreed with anybody how he will vote on any question in this body.

Mr. REED. Somebody has made the agreement for him, then.



Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; nobody makes an agreement for the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire—

Mr. REED. I repeat my statement, and I intend to make it good.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The statement is untrue.

Mr. REED. I call the Senator to order, and if he is not called to order I shall bring him to order.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Missouri made a statement as to every Republican Senator. I rose to a question of personal privilege and stated that so far as this Senator is concerned he was mistaken in his statement. He repeated it, and I say the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. REED. That is a very different statement than that my statement was untrue. I have no objection to the Senator saying that I am mistaken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At least let the Senate maintain good humor if it can not maintain order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, answering, which I want to do fairly, the question of the Senator from Missouri, I say that we have not attended any conference of Republican Senators with regard to this bill. I have no doubt that some Senators have discussed the matter among themselves, but I do say that in so far as I know there is no Republican Senator bound to vote in any particular way with regard to this bill.

I am thoroughly in favor of the limitation of debate proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, reserving only one point of difference, provided always that it is not made to apply to instances in which a caucus has been held and Senators bound to vote in a particular manner without regard to their own judgment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. That ought to be evidence enough that there has been no caucus on our side that binds anybody to vote in any particular way.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator from Iowa if he will say to the Senate and the country that an arrangement has not been made on that side of the Chamber by which the pending bill is to be referred to a committee, and if an agreement has not been arrived at to support that proposition between the Republican side and the seven gentlemen upon this side who have been voting with the Republicans?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know, Mr. President. As far as I am concerned, no such agreement has been entered into.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Georgia will allow me just a moment, I believe it to be true that there was a time when by discussion among Members on this side of the Chamber it was understood that it was the view of the Senators upon this side that the bill should be recommitted in order that the committee might consider certain amendments which had been proposed, but which it was apparent at that time could not be considered.

Mr. REED. The question of purpose is not in this matter. Everybody has a purpose for every vote he casts. We need not go into the purpose back of any agreement. I want to know if the Senator proposes to tell the country that there has not been an agreement, an understanding, or an arrangement pursuant to which all of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, with the exception of Senators LA FOLLETTE and NORRIS, have been voting solidly to recommit this bill and if that arrangement between the Republican side and the seven Democrats has not produced a concert of action which has been manifested in something like 25 or 30 votes?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will answer that now, and then I will yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

In so far as I know there is no agreement among Senators with respect to anything. I believe it to be true that the views of Senators with regard to recommitting this bill were known; I think known to all of us, because we came to a time when, if there was to be any opportunity for presenting amendments at all, the bill had to be recommitted, and I think the views or purpose of every Senator upon this side of the Chamber were known with regard to that motion. But there was no agreement, there was no obligation, there was no attempt upon the part of the Senators upon this side to impose upon any Senator the force of a caucus or the force of a conference even.

Mr. REED. No; you just all got together, or, if you did not all get together at one time, you just passed the word around in something like this form: "Now, it is understood that we are going to make a motion to recommit the bill, and we are all going to stand to it," and then Members were asked if they would stand to it, and these tactics were pursued until you found out you could get a nearly solid Republican vote. Then

an arrangement was made with the seven Democrats to assist in carrying through the scheme. I want to ask you if such pledges were not obtained.

Mr. CUMMINS. If what?

Mr. REED. If pledges were not obtained to the effect that the two different parties to this arrangement would stand together solidly to recommit this bill, and if they have not carried that agreement into effect by voting together even upon mere points of order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I never heard of any pledge by anyone. I have heard Senators state how they intended to vote. I have a substitute for this bill, and I have been exceedingly anxious to secure an opportunity to present it to the committee or to present it to the Senate, and I have asked, I suppose, every Member upon his side of the Chamber his views with regard to that substitute. I have asked a good many Senators upon the other side of the Chamber other than the seven to whom the Senator from Missouri refers and I intend to ask as many more as I can reach, for I have a perfect right to know what Senators believe with respect to a measure which I intend to propose. But there has not been a suggestion of a caucus or a conference the outcome of which would bind those who were opposed to the measure to vote for it, and that is the vice of the Democratic caucus. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, who has been standing for some time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, although it would not be necessary to correct the statement of the Senator from Missouri for the benefit of anyone who recalls exactly what has been said on this subject before on this floor, yet I think it is not right that the statement as he has put it in the Record this morning should be allowed to go uncontradicted and unchallenged. In the interest of truth and accuracy I think it is well for the Senate and the country to know exactly what happened in reference to this matter.

The Senator refers to certain gentlemen on this side of the Chamber who found themselves unable to agree with their associates on this matter, and who had, I think, given their associates ample notice of their disagreement, some of whom at least were acting under the express rule of the caucus of the party to which the Senators on this side belong, and who conferred among themselves, not with Republicans, and determined among themselves to make an effort to recommit this bill, so that it might be amended in certain particulars, so that those Senators might be enabled, some of them at least, to support it when it came to a final vote. If there is anything like treason in that, the Senator can make the most of it.

Mr. REED. Oh, I did not say anything about treason. The Senator may characterize his own conduct.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator undoubtedly has attempted at various times to leave that impression.

The Senator said that this motion or this movement came from the Republican side of the Chamber. The very reverse is true, and the Senator from Missouri either knows it or ought to know it if he can understand the English language, because the truth has been repeatedly stated here before.

Now, pursuing this subject with the utmost frankness and with the candor to which the Senate is entitled: When the seven Democrats who wanted this bill recommitted in order that it might be amended in certain particulars, in the hope that amendments would remove some of their objections to it, made up their minds to make that motion they inquired on the Republican side whether the Republicans were inclined to support that motion, and were informed that it was the belief over there that the Republican side would support that motion. There has been a good deal said—

Mr. REED. And then what?

Mr. HARDWICK. And then what? Then it was made.

Mr. REED. Then it was made?

Mr. HARDWICK. Made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], just as good a Democrat as sits in this Chamber.

Mr. REED. Then there was an agreement made between seven Democrats on this side and somebody professing to represent the Republicans on the other side?

Mr. HARDWICK. I should not call it an agreement.

Mr. REED. You just said an agreement was made.

Mr. HARDWICK. No.

Mr. REED. What was made?

Mr. HARDWICK. I said we were informed that the Republicans intended to support this motion to recommit. We did not go to the Senator from Missouri for support. We knew he could not support it.

Mr. REED. Why, certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, one more thing. There has been complaint made about a failure to notify Senators.



Mr. REED. No; let me state at this moment—

Mr. HARDWICK. All right; I will yield to the Senator if I may.

Mr. REED. Before I am—

Mr. CUMMINS. Before we go further I should like to have an understanding that I am not to lose the floor.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; I yield further.

Mr. HARDWICK. I would not proceed if it would cut off the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Iowa asked for 15 minutes, and he has had nearly an hour.

Mr. LIPPITT. Most of the time the Senator has challenged the Senator from Iowa with using has been occupied by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The RECORD will show the fact about that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I think it will.

Mr. REED. The Senator says that the seven Democrats at a meeting agreed that they were going to try to get some amendments on the bill which would enable them to support it, and thereupon they communicated with the Republican side, and that the Republican representative or the Republican side said they would see what could be done. I then asked, "And then what?" And the Senator said an understanding or agreement was made.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not intend to make that statement. I did not make it. If the Senator will let me answer—

Mr. REED. What was that understanding or agreement?

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me answer. I ask the Senator not to put words in my mouth which I did not use. We were informed that the Republicans would vote for a motion to recommit. Exactly what negotiation or arrangement or conferences or conversations were had on that side I did not know, because I had nothing to do with it. My part was that I agreed to vote to recommit the bill so that certain amendments could be made to it that would enable the Democrats who felt like I did to vote for it when amended. That is all that happened as far as I know. I have considered myself bound, as the Senator knows and as I think I have stated to him, to support a motion to recommit. I am not only bound, but I am willing and anxious to do so.

Mr. REED. Not only willing, but bound to it because it is an agreement. Are you not, Senator?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. REED. Frankly?

Mr. HARDWICK. In utmost frankness, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. Just one thing more. Because of the agreement with my associates on this side—

Mr. REED. And because of the agreement that they made with the Republicans on the other side.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not so consider that; I do not think they have such an agreement.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator also know that there are certain Republicans on the other side of the Chamber who have repeatedly said that they would be obliged to vote in a certain way because they were bound to support the motion to recommit?

Mr. HARDWICK. If they were, they were not bound by me and not by any conference I had with them. I want the Senator to get that exactly right.

I want to say one thing more, and then I will trespass no longer on the time of the Senator from Iowa. There was no question of taking advantage of anyone. Within 15 minutes from the time the Republican side knew of this proposed motion—and I think it was within a very short time, only a few minutes after that—it was freely discussed in the Democratic cloakroom. There was no surprise about this thing. You gentlemen knew that this motion was coming.

Mr. REED. I want to say to the Senator, speaking for myself, that I had not the slightest information that it was coming until I heard the motion made on the floor by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. HARDWICK. The discussion was so general on this side that Senators were discussing whether the motion was in order, and had a discussion with the Vice President. I do not know about that, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Leave the Vice President out.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course the Presiding Officer, it was known, had to rule on it, and I assume they discussed it in the cloakroom.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Vice President made no ruling in advance.

Mr. HARDWICK. Be that as it may, the parliamentary experts on this side were discussing whether the motion was in order and made, as soon as it could be made, the precise point that the Vice President sustained and was overruled about. That is all there is to it. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question. I think I ought to proceed with my remarks, but for a question I would be glad to yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to make a statement just in this connection since I have been brought into this debate.

Mr. CUMMINS. With the understanding that I am not to be taken from the floor, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I have never done anything in politics or in the performance of official duty that I was unwilling for the public to know. I have always maintained that the utmost publicity in public matters is conducive to efficient service and promotive of the public good. All my life I have opposed the secret caucus. If I had my way I should take the door off of every committee room in this Capitol and turn the spot light upon every caucus, that the public might see and hear through the newspapers the discussions of all questions dealing with the affairs of the people. The people have a right to know how their representatives vote in caucus and act on committees and their reasons therefor, because we all understand that the larger amount of legislation is proposed in the caucus and finished in the committee rooms. I have been opposed to the ship-purchase bill since first I informed myself of its provisions. I think I announced my opposition to it before it was known what stand the Democrats of the Senate would take upon it. When this matter under discussion came up at our first conference I said distinctly to my colleagues who were inclined to think and act about it as I do, and I have repeated it at every subsequent conference: "You owe me nothing; there is no agreement between us that is binding upon you to do or not to do anything pertaining to the ship-purchase bill that does not meet your approval or accord with your sense of duty. If we can act in harmony, doing what we believe to be our duty in the premises, and defeat the bill, I shall be greatly pleased, but I want it distinctly understood that my opposition to the bill and my action in opposing the bill will not be determined in the least by what either or all of you may do." I was opposed to the bill then, and I am still opposed to it, and I wanted to recommit it.

In a casual conversation with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] I asked him what would be the attitude of the Republicans on the question of recommitting the bill. He replied that he thought a majority of the Republicans would vote to recommit it. I do not want to be misunderstood about the matter. My first and foremost purpose in recommitting the bill was to kill it. I believe it to be a pernicious piece of legislation, and I wanted to get it off of the calendar. I wanted to recommit it, amend it, or do anything else that I could do to get it out of the way. In discussing the matter further with Senators CLARKE, O'GORMAN, and HARDWICK, and other Senators with whom I have affiliated in this fight against the bill, I stated the result of my conversation with Senator WEEKS but always emphasized the fact that they were not in any way bound to me. I want that understood.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, the Senator understands that several of his colleagues on this side did not go that far.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand that several of my colleagues did not go that far. They were opposed to the bill upon principle, some of them on the ground of Government ownership, and yet others who thought the bill might be amended so as to make it possible for them to vote for it; but I was not opposed to it upon that principle. As I have said on the floor of this Chamber heretofore, I would be perfectly willing at the proper time to consider a proper measure looking to State ownership of public utilities, including railroads, ships, and so forth. But not until after the American people—especially that part who compose the great Democratic Party—shall have had an opportunity to consider it and make some declaration upon the policy. I know that the Democratic Party as a political organization does not agree with me on the question of public ownership. But some of the other Senators do not agree with me about that, and, recognizing that fact, I desired to make it clear that there was no agreement between us which in any way hindered or prevented each one of us from following his own judgment and doing the things that his sense of duty might dictate. I am



going to vote against the ship-purchase bill; I am going to vote to recommit it if I shall be the only Senator on the floor of this Chamber, be he Republican or Democrat, who votes that way.

Now, that is where I stand on this question. There has been no secrecy or desire on my part, or on that of any of my colleagues that I am aware of, to conceal anything that we have done or said from the whole wide world. There has been no attempt to bind this Senator or that Senator. There has been no attempt by me to control or dictate to any Senator in the performance of his great function here. I think my colleagues with whom I have conferred in this matter understand this question just as I do. Mr. President, I am opposed upon principle to secret caucus instruction. I think such methods are subversive—destructive of the very genius—of the vital principles upon which our Government rests. There is no form of despotism or tyranny so despicable and undemocratic as binding by caucus action the minds and consciences of the servants of the people in the performance of their official duties. Freedom of action and utmost liberty of thought are the necessary prerequisites to writing into the law the best thoughts and highest purposes of the serious-minded, patriotic representatives in this body of the sovereign States of this Republic. I believe in the patriotism of party organization. I believe in the virtue that results from co-operative action on the part of men holding kindred views touching governmental matters and moved forward by a common ambition. Legislation wrought in that way is always helpful, proper, beneficial. It is the ripened fruit of legitimate and sound mental and spiritual processes. But when men are driven—forced—to subordinate their own views and act under the dictation of others, who themselves are sometimes acting under orders, we must expect such laws to partake more of the spirit of tyranny than of a government deriving all of its just powers from the consent of the governed, whose laws should be at all times for the protection of the people.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, inasmuch as this matter has received—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask, while this matter is under consideration, will the Senator from Iowa indulge me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas under the same conditions.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, there is no mystery about the way and occasion when the seven Senators on this side of the Chamber happened to cooperate. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is substantially correct, that there is what might be considered an understanding about what would be done with the motion to recommit. The circumstances under which the motion was made were in a measure accidental.

On the morning of the day on which I made the motion, after the Sergeant at Arms had called me to the Senate three different times to make a quorum, I came into the Senate Chamber much disposed to make my attendance very brief. I had been going along day after day for about four weeks helping to make a quorum, being paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], doing everything that the most ardent advocate of the bill could do to help it along, feeling that I would allow the responsibility for its passage to rest upon those who favored it. I did not favor it and never had favored it as a permanent proposition.

I discussed the bill with some persons in official life and some persons outside of official life in the late summer of last year before the cotton crop began to move. It was then thought feasible as a temporary means of transporting cotton to foreign markets ready to purchase it. I favored it solely as an emergency proposition. When I came into the Senate Chamber on the morning of the day on which the motion to commit was made, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] said to me, "The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I believe, is working on a plan to beat the shipping bill." I replied, "I am glad to hear this; I shall hunt him up and join him."

In the course of half an hour, or such a matter, I was invited to go to the room of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, where a number of Senators were assembled. I said, "I believe this bill has progressed now for a sufficient length of time to satisfy us that the opposition to it is not going to permit it to pass. There does not seem to be any sentiment in the country in its favor; the pressure in its favor is local and special, and I believe that sooner or later the effort to pass it will give way. I want the bill recommitted to the Committee on Commerce for the purpose of creating a hiatus on our calendar, so that I may move to take up the river and harbor bill and

the bill which provides a system of rural credits. I do not want to fritter away the entire session without having made some substantial effort toward something for the people whom I represent." Other Senators had other reasons. As the Senator from Mississippi states, his reason was to defeat the bill entirely; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] desired to have the bill recommitted for the purpose of amending it; and so the comments and discussion about the bill went forward. The motion to recommit the bill was one motion upon which we could all agree.

It was suggested that as the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] had been interesting himself in the various parliamentary stages that were transpiring here from time to time, that he be sent for to know what would be the attitude of the Republicans on a motion to recommit. He expressed a preference for the continued consideration of the bill and a daily adjournment. I suggested that that would not meet the purpose I had in view, as I wanted the bill recommitted with the definite purpose of opening up the calendar for such action on other bills as the majority of the Senate might see proper to take. He said he did not know at that time what would be the vote on the Republican side of the Chamber until after some conference with his associates, either general or individually, when he would be better able to inform us of their attitude. In a short time he returned to say that the Republican minority would vote for a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce. Their vote, added to the seven votes we had, made the number sufficient to carry out that purpose.

It is not my purpose to say that the action of the seven Senators on this side in no way depended upon what the Republicans through the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] indicated a willingness to do. We were thereby advised that we could accomplish our purpose to recommit the bill on a basis of cooperation that we could afford to adopt. I am not disposed to make any denial or concealment of anything connected with this incident that is true. What I have stated is just exactly what occurred. It therefore does not offend me when Senators say that we are supporting the motion to commit as the result of an agreement or understanding with some of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber. But no express or tacit understanding exists for cooperation beyond a vote on the pending motion to recommit.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the matter has been discussed upon the other side, I think it but fair to state my own attitude toward the bill.

I am very much opposed to the bill, but I am not opposed to the Government buying ships and operating ships in commerce. My objection to the bill lies principally to the intervention of the irresponsible corporation with minority stockholders, the presence of whom, in my opinion, will destroy the effort that is being made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. May I proceed? I beg pardon.

Mr. REED. I want to say to the Senator—of course I can not interrupt him unless he permits me—but I do hope, if he is going to leave the theme we were on, that he will permit me to ask him a question about it before he leaves it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Missouri wish to ask me a question with regard to that?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, I intend to state very briefly my answer to the question heretofore put to me by the Senator from Missouri. Then I shall submit the matter, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senate will remember that at one time the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] introduced a substitute for the shipping bill. Upon the substitute he instantly demanded the yeas and nays. They were ordered upon the spot, and a short while after that the Senator who occupied the chair held, or I understood him to hold, that there could be no amendment presented to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida. Of course I was interested in presenting my amendment, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was interested in presenting his two amendments, for without his two amendments and without the adoption substantially of the substitute which I proposed to offer I was opposed to the bill. I was in deep earnest in securing further action on the part of the committee. I wanted the bill recommitted to the committee in order that it might come from the committee in such form as that amendments could be offered to it if the committee did not itself make those amendments. I asked certain Senators upon this side of the Chamber how they



would vote upon a motion to recommit, and they told me. That is all the connection I have had with any conference or with any arrangement with regard to the conduct of the bill.

The Senator from Missouri must be perfectly aware that there is a vast difference between these two things. Assume that all the Democratic Members were present at the caucus—53; that 36 of them vote for the bill and 16 of them vote against the bill; the effect of the rule to which I have referred binds the 16 who have recorded their judgment against the bill to vote for it—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment—whereas if the 53 Senators who were present were each asked how he would vote upon the bill and each one answered truthfully, it would be a conference and might be helpful; it might be beneficial; I do not say that it would not; I believe in the interchange of views and in the expression of views, but the vice appears when we come to a resolution that imposes the judgment of one man upon another and compels him in honor, if he respects his party obligation, to abandon his own conviction and accept that of another man.

Now, Mr. President, I intend to do whatsoever I can here and elsewhere to make it impossible for the members of any political party in any legislative assembly to hold a caucus to determine how the members of the body shall vote upon a particular measure and attempt to bind them to a particular course. I have therefore offered this amendment, which does nothing more than to declare that in cases in which such a caucus has been held and such an order or declaration made, this rule shall not apply; and if in the future there is no such caucus held by either of the political parties, then the rule will be as general in its operation with my amendment as it will be without it. But now is the time and this is the place for those who are opposed to caucus domination upon matters of legislation to attach my amendment to the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska, for if we do I venture to say there never again will be held a caucus in the Capitol that attempts to bind members of a political party to vote for a particular bill.

I close by saying—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator some questions before he closes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first I want to correct a statement which has been made here so often that it needs correction. The Senator has spoken of 35 Democrats voting for an instruction, and of 16 Democrats voting against it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I said 36.

Mr. REED. Thirty-six for it and sixteen against it.

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; I did not say so. I simply presented that spectacle. I did not say that 55 Senators gathered together in this caucus and 36 of them voted one way and 16 the other. I said that that would be the effect of a rule of this sort if observed.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator then was dealing with a hypothetical case.

Mr. CUMMINS. I said so.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator may not know that every man who was at this conference voted for the instruction.

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; as I understand, there were in the first place 35—

Mr. REED. I am talking about the final vote.

Mr. CUMMINS. Thirty-five who voted in favor of the bill and three, four, or five against it. Then one of the Senators who voted against the instruction or against the bill changed his vote in order that there might be two-thirds, in compliance with the rule of 1903. Then I think the other two or three Members moved to make it unanimous, and there were probably 38, 39, or 40 votes.

Mr. REED. The Senator is misinformed. There was one vote on the roll call against the proposition—not the proposition to bind, but against the proposition—that Senator having said that he was willing to go with his associates, but that he desired to record his vote in order to express his preference, after that was done the action of the conference was made unanimous. It, of course, does not follow that all those who were outside of the conference were against the bill. As a matter of fact they were not.

Now, passing from that, which straightens up the statement of fact, I desire to ask the Senator if he thinks it was any worse for a body of men, all the representatives of a party, to get together in a room, discuss a proposition, and then, if two-thirds of them favor the proposition, for the others to feel bound thereby, than it is for an individual Senator to take the individual pledges of other Senators to stand by him or to stand by some certain proposition?

Mr. CUMMINS. Does that complete the question?

Mr. REED. Yes. Is one any worse in principle than the other?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe that any man should pledge himself to vote in any particular way, whether to a caucus or to an individual Senator. I think it is perfectly proper for a Senator to declare to another how he intends to vote upon a particular, a special proposition. In other words, every honest man must keep his mind free to vote as he believes he ought to vote.

Mr. REED. And he ought to maintain that condition of mind up to the time he casts his vote.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know of any circumstance that would alter that.

Mr. REED. Now, is it not a fact that—

Mr. CUMMINS. But that is no defense. Why does the Senator from Missouri desire discussion upon that question of ethics?

Mr. REED. The Senator will get it in my next question.

Mr. CUMMINS. That does not pertain to my amendment. The question here is whether the Senator from Missouri is in favor of a caucus which attempts to bind the members of a political organization to a certain bill or a certain course. If there are other vicious methods prevailing in the Senate Chamber, they can be reached in some other fashion, I am sure, but they are not material here.

Mr. REED. The question here is a choice of procedure. I asked the Senator the question whether he believed that it was right for a Senator to take the pledges of his fellow Senators to support a given proposition. He stated in reply that he thought no Senator should give any pledge or any promise; that he should keep his mind open until the time for voting. I want to ask the Senator if, in and about this very controversy, he has not asked certain Senators how they would vote, and if they have not thereupon stated that they were going to vote a certain way, and if certain of the Senators referred to have not actually gone to him and asked to be released from that arrangement, and if he has not declined to release them?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not true in any sense. It is true that certain Senators told me how they intended to vote upon the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED. And is it not true—

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not true that Senators have asked me to be relieved from any promise, because they made me no promise or pledge.

Mr. REED. Is it not true that afterwards these certain Senators came to the Senator from Iowa and stated to him in substance and effect that they desired to be released from voting upon certain propositions pertaining to the question of recommitment, or which concerned it, and that the Senator from Iowa said to them in substance and effect they were in honor bound?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is a measure of truth in that.

Mr. REED. Yes. Well, about how much measure now?

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, so far as the Senator from Missouri is concerned he is not my instructor in political ethics. If I were seeking some one to lift me to a higher plane in political life, I would not address myself to the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I decline to yield a moment further. When the Senator from Missouri has so far forgotten himself as to intrude the subject which he has just suggested upon the Senate, I decline to yield for a single moment.

Mr. REED. Very well; I will reply in my own time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will attempt to declare now to the Senate exactly what happened. I do it with very great reluctance, because it draws into the discussion a matter which ought to be purely personal and which ought not to have been mentioned here at all, and I think the Senator from Missouri has violated all the proprieties between gentlemen in mentioning the subject which he has just introduced.

It is true that when the motion to recommit was proposed I asked certain Senators how they would vote upon the motion to recommit. They knew my interest in it perfectly well, because I had a substitute for the bill, for which I desired consideration; I desired it earnestly and sincerely, and a ruling of the Chair, as I understood, had precluded me from offering it upon the floor of the Senate. I wanted the motion to recommit sustained, because I believed that if the subject were again considered by the Committee on Commerce the view which I entertained would prevail in the committee, and I was trying hard to impress upon my fellow Senators the merit of the proposal that I had laid before the Senate in the form of a substitute. I asked Senators how they would vote on the motion



to recommit, and they told me how they would vote on the motion to recommit.

The only other question that ever came up between those Senators and myself was whether a motion to recommit with instructions to report two certain amendments—mine, of course, not included—was consistent with the purposes and the objects of a motion to recommit. I said, and I have no hesitation in saying it again and publicly, now that the Senator from Missouri has made it public, that a motion to recommit with instructions to report forthwith two certain amendments is not the same as a motion to recommit so that the committee could again take the subject under consideration and report according to its view of the whole matter.

The Senator from Missouri has now the entire personal, confidential communication between the Senators whom he had in mind and myself. I want them to understand that I would not have willingly obtruded upon the Senate an intimate, personal matter of this character, and that it has only been drawn from me by the Senator from Missouri in his endeavor to break the force of an argument against the caucus and to divert the attention of the public from the practice of controlling legislation by a secret caucus to the effort upon my part—and upon the part of other Senators, too—to put this bill into such form and in such parliamentary situation as that amendments could be offered to it.

Mr. President, I hope sincerely that the amendment I have proposed will prevail. If it does, I intend to vote for the limitation of debate proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. If it does not, I shall vote against it, because I will not willingly forego my right to protest on the floor of the Senate against a bill which comes here as the result of a party caucus, accompanied with a binding resolution which compels every member of that organization to support it or suffer a charge of party disloyalty and treason.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Iowa has paid me the compliment of saying that if he desired a political mentor he would not call upon me. Mr. President, I have not been posing as a political mentor for the Senator from Iowa, for the Democratic Party, or for the country, but if I know anything about the history of public matters for the last five or six years the Senator from Iowa has assumed that he is a sort of political Baedeker not only for the Republican Party and for all of its hitherto discordant and disunited elements, but for the country at large. He is now attempting to enlarge the field of his operations so that he may regulate the business of the Democratic Party.

Having succeeded to a large extent in disrupting his own party, by adhering to his favorite doctrine that when he can not control a party he will ruin it, he now crosses the aisle of the Chamber and poses as one entirely capable of managing the business of the Democratic side. He assumes the self-righteous air of a man who is capable of directing the morals and shaping the ethics of everybody else on earth.

If I were inclined to act as guide for others, I surely would not undertake to act as the political mentor for a man who stands here on the floor of the Senate and in one breath denounces the meeting together in a room of all the Members of the Senate who represent a political party, where there is a full and fair and free discussion, where, at least so far as those men are concerned, the question is settled upon its merits, and yet who thinks it is highly proper to have a secret meeting between three or four Senators and to exchange mutual pledges. Who, while he is denouncing public caucuses and public agreements, still insists that it is entirely right to have private agreements and who, when charged with the fact, pleads that it is grossly impolite to even mention the fact that a private agreement had been made.

Let us see where the distinguished Senator stands. The Democrats had a caucus or a conference. Every Member was invited. They came there representing States from all parts of this Union. They had full and fair and free discussion. They agreed to abide by the action of two-thirds. They finally got a vote of all of the Members present in favor of a proposition. They were then merely, as a matter of honor, bound to support that proposition. Any one of them could say he would not obey the caucus vote. If any one of them said it was a matter of conscience with him, he was not required under the rules to obey it. If he said that in his opinion anything required was violative of the Constitution of the United States, he was not bound to obey it. If he said that he had made pledges to his people to the contrary, he was not bound to obey it, and in the last analysis he was not bound to obey it at all except merely as a matter of honor between gentlemen. A record was kept of

the proceedings of that caucus. While it is not generally public, it is open to all of those who participate and to all members of the conference. That it is not in any sinister sense secret is shown by the fact that all of the proceedings of the caucus have been exposed here upon this floor freely and without protest. Indeed, the proceedings of our caucuses are generally, in substance, printed in the newspapers.

The Senator condemns that, and says that is wrong, that is wicked. Then the Senator says it is all right for him to get one or two or three or a dozen men together and say to them, "How do you stand?" Of course he did not say to them, "You ought to stand this way" or "You ought to stand that way," or "You ought to stand with me." He just puts it to them, "How do you stand?" They say, "Well, we stand in a certain way." Thereupon days intervene, debate intervenes, motion after motion comes up, and these Senators say to the Senator from Iowa, "We do not think we ought to be bound; we desire to vote differently," and the Senator from Iowa says, "I can not release you from our agreement." The Senator from Iowa says that kind of secret meeting is so sacred a thing that it is wrong even to mention it, ungentlemanly to expose it to the public gaze. Such, sir, is the indefensible position in which the Senator from Iowa finds himself.

Mr. President, one of the great reasons for conferences and party caucuses is to get rid of secret agreements among individual members. It is to substitute party agreement for private agreement; party council for private conspiracy. It is to put the responsibility for public policies upon a political party instead of leaving them to the tender mercies of self-constituted leaders who go about pledging enough men to stand with them so that by private conspiracy they may control the public business.

Why, Mr. President, it is well known that before party conferences came to be recognized that the very cause for the birth of the party conference, the condition of affairs I have described existed. Before the party conference came into being sinister influences were often able to obtain the support of a small coterie of men who, by uniting their votes and throwing them first to one side and then to the other, could control legislation. These gentlemen were merely political pirates, engaged in the business of destroying honest legislation. Albeit, instead of the pirates' black flag bearing the honest skull and crossbones of their trade, they usually fly the milk-white banner of reform, emblazoned with a halo of virtue. Also their motto has been and is independence. Loudly they proclaim that they owe allegiance to nobody and to no party. They are a law unto themselves. They possess all wisdom and all goodness. Under such conditions when the people undertook to determine who was responsible for legislative iniquity it was frequently very hard to fasten that responsibility upon any individual or any political party. Therefore, in order to avoid the evil of secret conferences and private conspiracies between men elected to represent the people, the plan was adopted of bringing all of the members of a party into a room and inducing them there to cast their votes and express their opinions, so that when a man saw fit to organize a coterie of his own he had at least to assume the obloquy of having broken with his party associates. The caucus was intended to abolish the private conference and the private agreement and the private conspiracy in which the Senator from Iowa practically admits he was concerned with reference to this bill.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I am getting a little tired of this "holier than thou art" proclamation from gentlemen who are engaged in that sort of thing.

One word further. Without intending to provoke any particular discussion or debate, I asked the question this morning whether the Senator from Iowa believed that it was any worse to call the members of a political party in a room, and, after having full and fair council, determining by a two-thirds vote what should be done than it was to get all the members of a political party into a secret agreement or conspiracy and then extending that agreement so as to take in Senators upon the other side so that complete unity of action results? After a good deal of discussion, which has occasioned some acrimony and some avowals that what I charged by my question was untrue, the bald truth is at last made plain, so plain that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, can not err therein." It is this: That a conference or caucus was, in fact, held upon the other side. I do not mean they all got together in a room at one time and by formal action, where there was a chance for mutual expression of opinion, they finally arrived at a determination. What I do say is that an agreement was in fact made, and that is the purpose of a caucus. It is all a caucus can do. Whether the agreement is obtained by going from Member to Member or whether it is done by calling all in a room, when-



ever you find that a concert of opinion and action has been arranged and agreed upon, whether it is done in one room or a dozen rooms, the result is none the less a conference or a caucus, sir. The place where you do the thing is not important. The particular manner in which you do it is of no concern. The whole question is, Did you do it? And it now stands admitted that an agreement was made upon the other side and that the seven Democrats joined in that agreement.

It also stands admitted that the Senator from Iowa pledged some of his fellow Members—or if he did not actually pledge them he asked them what they were going to do—and then, when the course of conduct was entered upon, he held them to their previous statements, and thus put upon them every coercion that a conference can put upon any man. He put upon them the coercion of their honor, of their agreement, of their binding pledge, which is all any man can give to any conference or any caucus; and yet, pure brain, from his holy lips, from his sacred tongue, comes a denunciation of others who get together in a more open way and in a fairer way and arrive at an agreement!

Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites!

An attempt has been made during this debate to at least convey the impression that there had been no concerted action on this side among the seven Democrats and no agreement between the seven Democrats and the Republicans.

Again, they did not all get in a room together; but, again, it now stands admitted, that seven Democrats did get together and did arrive at a conclusion, and that a representative of the Republican side met a representative of the seven, and the agreement was then and there made, and it has been religiously adhered to ever since. We have found the seven voting every time with the almost solid Republican side. We have found them voting together upon questions of order even; upon the construction of the rules. They have stood together with a fidelity that would have done credit to a Greek phalanx in the days of Alexander. You could not break the spear of one unless you were able to overcome the entire number.

The only exceptions to this binding rule and agreement on the other side is found in the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who refused to enter the conspiracy. Outside of them, the agreement has held every Republican fast and firm, immutable and indestructible; and acting with the Republicans, without a variation or the least shadow of turning, have been the seven Democrats on this side. Regretting as much as I do the fact that the agreement was made, regretting as much as I do the fact that seven Democrats were willing to act with the Republicans on the other side, I yet give the allies credit for standing hitched, for keeping their agreement once they had made it. At least, it appears that there is honor among Republicans and Democratic sinners. They do keep their agreements. Let us hear no further denial in this Chamber that there was an agreement, and let all the subterfuges and evasions that have been resorted to now be wiped out, for we now know the fact; it stands admitted and confessed that there was an agreement. An agreement is none the less an agreement if made as was the one at Gerry's celebrated dinner, wherein gentlemen arrived at a gentleman's understanding, or if it be made in a garret between a band of highwaymen who are about to go on a marauding expedition, the conversation being in the lingo of the slums, or whether it be solemnly written down and signed; if there is one mind and one purpose, there is an agreement. It is utterly immaterial whether that agreement be arrived at in a caucus or in an alley, you arrive in the end at the same thing.

The Senator from Iowa is at this moment a party to such an agreement. It does not lie in his mouth to read lectures to Democrats because they held a conference.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before I take up the proposed amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], which I expect to oppose, I want to say a few words in regard to the caucus and perhaps the filibuster. I am led to it because of what has been said by the Senator from Iowa and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I also desire to do so because the pending amendment of the Senator from Iowa is intended to be a blow at the caucus, and while I shall not support this amendment I am just as much in favor of dealing a blow to the caucus as any man in this body or elsewhere.

In speaking of the caucus and caucus control, Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I am not insinuating or attempting to insinuate that because a man believes in caucus rule, and I do not, that I am therefore better than he or that I do not admit the honesty of his purpose and the patriotism of his motives.

I have heard it said many times since I have been in Washington, in the other House and in this, mostly in the other, by great leaders, great statesmen, that this is a Government of parties. I have heard the doctrine promulgated by Mr. Cannon, who was formerly Speaker of the House of Representatives; I have heard this same doctrine promulgated by the present Speaker of the House of Representatives. I hear it here.

Personally, I believe the theory is wrong; but I do not believe that any man has any right or privilege when, believing it is wrong, I condemn it, to say to me that I am putting myself up as a judge of the action of somebody else.

As against party responsibility I believe in individual responsibility. I know there is argument on both sides of the question, and a man has a right to be on either side and still retain his honesty, his patriotism, and, I think, his wisdom. So I am not going to cast any reflection on any man because he believes in a contrary doctrine.

One theory is that we should have two great political parties, and that when we get in a legislative body the members of one side belonging to one party should get together and agree upon a course to be taken in reference to some particular bill, that the other side shall get together and agree what the course of that party shall be, and that a majority or two-thirds, or whatever the rule might be, should decide the course of each one of the political parties.

In my judgment that is wrong. I believe that the American people are beginning to realize that it is wrong. I believe that the progressive spirit of the age is condemning it now and that the caucus will soon be relegated to the past.

If that theory be true, then all a man has got to do if he is in the House of Representatives or the Senate or any other deliberative body is to go to his caucus and do the best he can there to bring about the enactment in the caucus of the legislation which he favors. If he fails, then he supports the bill that he was opposed to or in a form that he is opposed to. If he succeeds, then, of course, he is gratified to know that his party has adopted his ideas.

Mr. President, I want to call your attention to an instance. Several years ago, under the prior administration, the question of reciprocity with Canada was brought up by the President in a special message and a great deal of debate and discussion took place on that law. You will remember that the reciprocity law was passed through the House of Representatives, sent over to the Senate, and failed here because of the expiration of the Congress; that the President called a special session, and that it was put through the House of Representatives the second time, and then again brought to the Senate.

I heard the speech of a noted Member of the House of Representatives who believed in party control and party government and in the submission of the individual to a majority of his political colleagues. I heard his speech made to his constituents after he had gone home at the end of that session. He had made his campaign for election on the theory that he was opposed to reciprocity with Canada. His people were opposed to it. He had denounced it all over his district. But he was a good Democrat. He came to the House of Representatives and his party held a caucus. He went into the caucus. Of course, it was secret. I do not know what happened there. I suppose he did just what he said he did. I have no doubt of it, because he was an honest, upright man. He fought against reciprocity in the caucus, but he was defeated. The Democratic Party in the House decided to stand by the Republican President in favor of Canadian reciprocity, and he voted with his party.

Then he went home, and he made another speech and this is the one I heard or read. He did not dwell much on it. He thought he was justified in the course he took. He assumed that his people would think that way. He said, "I was elected on an antireciprocity platform; I fought it; I denounced it"; and he said, "I carried out the instructions of my constituents. I went down to Washington, and I went into that Democratic caucus, and I did everything I could to defeat reciprocity."

Under one theory of government he had performed his full duty, but when he came to the place where his official action was recorded, he voted just the other way. That is party solidarity. That is party responsibility. That is government by party. That is the submission of the individual judgment to the judgment of his party colleagues.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that under the rule which applies in the Senate he need not have done anything of the kind; that he would have been released from the rule if he had notified his colleagues.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. I think the Democratic caucus of the House has the same kind of a rule, but there are men who



feel in honor bound to follow the party, and they are men of a high sense of honor. I am not sure but what I honor them for it. At least that is what he did. He followed his party.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. It seems to me the Senator must know that the rule is at least equally if not more liberal which prevails in the Democratic caucus than among the Republicans. At the time of which the Senator speaks the terms of the rules were published in the newspapers over and over again. There were a great many at that caucus who for the reason which could have been given by the Representative to whom the Senator has referred declined to be bound by that rule.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; I understand that.

Mr. HUGHES. A great many of them, I understand, remained in caucus and actually voted on the proposition and then declined to be bound without being held to any responsibility.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; and I have heard them condemned up one side and down the other until it seems to me a man could hardly stand up under the adverse criticism that was hurled at them.

Mr. HUGHES. It seems to me the Senator has had an unfortunate experience as far as caucuses are concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. I have had lots of it.

Mr. HUGHES. I am willing to admit that there may come a time when the caucus situation on this side of the Chamber may be what it was at one time on the Senator's side, but until that time arrives it seems to me that no general denunciation of caucus rule or of caucus measures ought to be indulged in. So far as I am concerned, my people care little or nothing whether I go into a caucus or not. I doubt if there are a hundred people in my district who are aware whether I have participated in a Democratic caucus, and they will not excuse me for any improvident vote I cast on the ground that I was following the caucus.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator means to say that his people are going to hold him responsible personally for his political action.

Mr. HUGHES. Undoubtedly.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what they ought to do.

Mr. HUGHES. Undoubtedly; and it would be idle for me to go before my people and plead the action of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. NORRIS. If the theory of caucus government is right, the Senator has a right to do that very thing. He can go to his people and say, "I was elected a Democrat, and the caucus of Democrats decided so and so, and I went with them." That is a defense under the caucus system of government.

Mr. HUGHES. Still I was about to state my position on this caucus proposition. I think there has been some change in the public sentiment toward the caucus, because of the manner in which the caucuses on this side of the Chamber at least have been conducted of late. If the Senator could get admission to one of our caucuses, and I do not see that any great harm would come either to the Senator or to our party if he were permitted to attend and listen, if not personally participate, I think his mind would be disabused of a great many erroneous ideas he has with reference to the caucus. I have gone into every Democratic caucus, and I have tried to bring about certain results, and in the final analysis I have always accepted what I have regarded as the best thing that could be gotten from the Democratic caucus.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it is your duty as a caucus Democrat to get the best you can, and to take what you can get.

Mr. HUGHES. But as to my duty as a Democrat, knowing that this side of the Chamber is charged with the legislation, and it is the only side of the Chamber to which one can look for legislation so long as I am satisfied that the Democratic caucuses are being held, as I firmly believe they are being held now, in the interest of the people of the United States, I propose to participate in them and to submit to their conclusions so long as I do participate in them. The moment that I come to the conclusion that the Senator came to some time ago I shall probably follow the course he followed. When I come to the conclusion that the Democratic caucus is being controlled by outside interests and influences, and not acting for the best interests of the people, I shall probably follow the Senator's course.

Mr. NORRIS. The question of the Senator was so long I have really forgotten the first part of it; but I am not finding fault with the Senator; I am not criticizing him for going into the Democratic caucus if he wants to do so. I think it is wrong. I think I have the privilege to say so, and I am not casting any insinuation on the Senator. He has a right to believe in that

kind of government if he wants to, if he believes that is the best way to get good results for the people. I do not believe it, and I have a right to say I do not believe it. Of course the Senator has attended Democratic caucuses where it is claimed it was free and fine, everything lovely, full, fair, free debate and discussion; but he says the caucuses of the other party are controlled by different influences and different interests. In other words—

Mr. HUGHES. I took the Senator's word for that a few moments ago.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir; you can get my word for that; but I want to say that the interests or the methods of controlling a caucus are not decided by the political party that is holding the caucus. The same interests that handle a Republican caucus held in secret will get in their work in a Democratic caucus held in secret. You are individuals and human beings the same as other people, no better and no worse. You can not make a caucus good because you call it Democratic and make it bad because you call it by another name.

I know that it is an impossibility to consider a bill of any great magnitude or importance in caucus. Are we elected to caucuses? The law provides, even the Constitution, that on the demand of one-fifth the roll shall be called and every man recorded. Here where we perform the official work that we are sent here to do, have we met fully our obligation to our people and our consciences when we permit our official work to be controlled by the work of a secret caucus?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to his colleague?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have been interested in the colloquy between my colleague and the Senator from New Jersey concerning the caucus. I notice the Senator from New Jersey makes the point that the caucus is an evil thing when it is controlled by outside influences. I want to say to my colleague what I think is generally understood by well-informed people in Washington to-day, that there would have been no Democratic caucus if it had not been for outside influences.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the case nine times out of ten. I am glad my colleague has made the statement. I had no doubt of it. I would rather it would come from him than from me, however.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. But as a rule that is always true, because, to put it down in a nutshell, a caucus is a means by which a minority can control a majority. We have an illustration of it in nearly every caucus that is held.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield, although I hope the Senator will be brief. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the Senator's colleague is mistaken.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose we let it go at that. I believe he is right.

Mr. HUGHES. I sat in the cloakroom when the matter of calling a caucus was first discussed. I was opposed to it. I did not feel that it was necessary, and I said so; but the order was gotten up and signed in my presence. I think I finally agreed to sign it. The Senator may have information not available to me, but my judgment is that the caucus was not asked for by any outside influence of any kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose the Senator from New Jersey will not try to have us believe that my colleague meant some outside influence made a written command and signed it in writing and sent it by some official to each Senator and told them to get together and hold a caucus.

Mr. HUGHES. No; I mean to say—

Mr. NORRIS. But the methods, the instrumentalities, were provided by the caucus itself. Now, I do not want to get into a debate as to whether your caucus was a good or a bad one or called regularly or anything else. That is nothing to me. I am willing to concede for argument's sake that it was good. The best in my judgment ever held are not fit to legislate. Here is the place to legislate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska has made the statement that this caucus never would have been called except for outside influence. That may mean something very sinister. I do not think the question ought to be left in that way.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not mean to say that it is sinister, necessarily; not by any means.

Mr. REED. No; but—

Mr. NORRIS. It might be and it might not be.



Mr. REED. The statement was made by the other Senator from Nebraska that an influence was exerted which, if it had not been exerted, would have resulted in no caucus being called, and the innuendo is left or the inference that that influence may have been sinister. I challenge any man on this floor to name an influence that produced our caucus except the influence of the Members of the Senate who signed the call.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, the Senator—

Mr. REED. I challenge the assertion and I insist that now is the time to speak. You should not rest upon insinuation and innuendo. I challenge an answer to my interrogatory. Now is the time to speak. Let us know the influence, and when and where the influence was put into force. If there is no answer, I have the right to assume that the statement is without warrant. There is no answer.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not stopped yet to get an answer. There may be one. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. REED. I had stopped twice and I stop now, and I challenge the Senator from Nebraska, who has the floor, to state upon his honor that there was any such influence, and tell how and when it was exerted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will pardon the Chair before he proceeds. The Chair desires to admonish the occupants of the galleries that under the rules of the Senate any demonstration of approval or disapproval of what transpires on the floor is forbidden. The Chair expresses the hope that the occupants of the galleries, who are there by the courtesy and permission of the Senate, will not again transgress the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I said a while ago I had no disposition to take up any particular caucus. I have no more fault to find with the last caucus that was held than with the one that was held eight years ago. I had yielded, however, to Senators who brought in the last caucus that was held of the Democratic Party, or the caucus on this bill; I do not know whether it was the last one or not. I have said, and I repeat now, I do not believe there would have been a caucus on this bill or a good many other bills if it had not been for influences outside of this Chamber. I repeat now what I said to the Senator from Missouri, that does not mean that the influence was sinister or that it was wrong. It may be proper, if you are going to run the Senate by a caucus, that individuals outside of the body ought to have something to say in the advisory council of the party that is trying to hold the caucus.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, just a matter of correction. The Senator said a good many caucuses had been held. I think I came into the Senate at the same time the Senator did. There have been in three years and over that I have been here just two caucus votes taken. We did not even take a caucus vote on the tariff bill. The other bill, in addition to this one, was a trivial measure. As a matter of fact, the caucus vote was passed as a sort of joke on those who had not seen fit to come. It was some small matter, I have forgotten what it was. So, when the Senator speaks of many caucus votes and many caucus actions, he is not accurate.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, in the first place, does not quote me accurately. I said there had been many caucuses, and I repeat it. There have been two within the last few weeks. You had a caucus the other night, so Democratic Senators told me, one the day before that—

Mr. REED. We had a conference.

Mr. NORRIS. That was a conference, was it? A rose would smell just as sweet called by any other name. You may call them all conferences if you want to; that is immaterial to me.

Mr. REED. Let me point out the difference to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not yield to the Senator unless he wants to take up time.

Mr. REED. I want to correct the statement and I will make it very brief.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I do not want to filibuster on this bill.

Mr. REED. The Democratic conference merely discusses the proposition, and is not supposed to bind anybody except as the general course of debate may lead Senators to a conclusion. When two-thirds of the members, however, have voted to make a question a matter of party action it is supposed to bind, with the exceptions that I named some time ago. So when I say to the Senator there have been many conferences, and that there have been but few caucuses, I am stating a distinction that is substantial and not merely chimerical. I do not think that even the Senator or anybody else can object to men getting together in a room and discussing a proposition, which is a Democratic conference.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not even objecting to getting together and discussing it in caucus if gentlemen want to do so. I do not

want Senators to continually put me in a false attitude. I do not believe in a caucus on legislative matters. Any Senator who does so believe has a perfect right to his belief, and a perfect right to attend a caucus. I believe caucuses result in bad government. You can not, in my judgment, get as good legislation if you do it through a caucus binding men to vote for what they do not believe in, and keeping out other men because they do not happen to wear the party tag, and preclude them from taking any part in the consideration of the matter you have up. I think it is a good thing for Senators or members of any legislative body to agree on any particular proposition, to get together on a proposition, and agree on a method which they shall adopt to bring about, if possible, the enactment of their views in legislative form.

But what do we have here? We are divided by that aisle, and when a Senator on one side talks with a Senator on the other in relation to a bill he is liable to criticism and to be held up to derision and suspicion. What we ought to have on any measure that comes up here is a meeting, without any political lines, without any partisan division, of those who favor it, and let those who oppose it get together if they so desire. I do not mean now to bind anybody, and I am speaking now of what the Senator from Missouri refers to as conferences. To that I agree. Next time there is a bill or something important up for consideration the same thing could take place, but what would happen if anybody undertook to do that here in the Senate? Because of the partisan feeling that exists and has existed for the years and years that have gone men would almost be ridiculed who would undertake it; and yet you hold a secret caucus, binding men who do not believe in a measure and precluding men who do believe in it even from offering an amendment or their views to be taken into consideration when you come to the enactment of the legislation. That is the evil of the caucus, particularly when it is partisan.

You not only bind men to vote contrary to their convictions, but you really decide upon a bill in secret, excluding Members, probably nearly one-half of the membership of the Legislature, from any participation in it. How often has it occurred when a bill has come in here that by long debate by men who were excluded from the councils of the men who drew the measure, you yourselves were convinced that there was something wrong with it and you took it back into caucus and changed it?

What happened when you brought in one of your great measures that was in your platform—the Trade Commission bill—without any caucus and with no attempt to bind any man? You brought it on the floor of the Senate; you had the active assistance of men on this side of the Chamber to help you shape the bill and to get it into good form. In the form in which you passed it you proclaimed to the country that it was a great achievement and you mentioned it in your campaign book; you talked of it on every stump in the last campaign, and yet some of the most valuable suggestions and amendments and assistance that you got you got from this side of the Chamber.

Why, Mr. President, that illustrates that it is not necessary for any party to go into a secret caucus to frame a bill, and then try to pass it through the assembly without giving members of a different political faith who believe in that kind of legislation the right to be heard and the right to perform the official functions which they are sent here to perform. So it has those two evils.

But, Mr. President, that is not all. The caucus is held in secret. If it is a good thing, then why not have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD record the proceedings of the caucus? If that is really the institution that does the legislation, then why not take down what is said and done and publish it to the world? It is always claimed that men are not coerced. If they are not, what is the use of a caucus? What good does it do? If you do not attempt to bind men to vote contrary to their convictions—

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator from Nebraska has stated that he either knows or assumes that some outside influence brought about the caucus. I should like to ask if he knows or assumes that any particular influence from any particular source was used for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I am not speaking of any caucus in particular. I said as a rule that was true of all caucuses. I said if you were going to run your government on that form, then it would be perfectly proper, in my judgment, for outside influence to come in and ask a caucus.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senators, further, if there was outside influence used for such purpose whether it could be other than sinister and improper?



Mr. NORRIS. I think it could. I will take that up. I did not intend to go into it at all until I had been interrupted, but I will answer that question. It is a very proper question. I think such influence could be other than sinister. If caucus control is right, then we ought to always have party solidarity; that is the object of a caucus, to get the members of a party to vote together on everything pertaining to the particular bill about which they are caucusing; to have all vote as a unit. That is for the party. I should say if the Members of the Senate believed in running this body through the mandates of a caucus and the President of the United States belonged to their party, they would consult with him, and very properly he would consult with them. They would consult with the Cabinet officers, and the men who are chairmen of their committees or otherwise high in the councils of the party in control would also be consulted and would have a right to have their views taken into consideration in party control.

If we are going to run our Government by a party caucus, then Members of the legislative body ought to shape their conduct—and when they act through caucus, as a rule they do so—they ought to shape their conduct so as to bring about the greatest possible benefit to that party. That is another objection I have to the caucus. It puts party above country. I am not by that expression intimating that anybody is unpatriotic who believes in a caucus. He thinks that to put his party first is the way to better his country.

Mr. President, I read last night in a paper published in my State a very able article of about two columns describing the Democratic quarrel in the State of Nebraska between the Secretary of State and my colleague here. I thought it was a very fair statement from the editor's standpoint. He went on to give the names of candidates for post offices, for United States marshalships, for the land offices at different places where the terms of the Republican officials had long ago expired but no Democrat had been appointed.

The argument in relation to every case was made in that editorial, and not in a single instance was the question ever raised or anything said about the qualifications of the man to fill the place—not once—but the argument was, "Here is a man who has been a Democrat for 20 years; the Senator from Nebraska has recommended him for this office; and he is held up." Why? Because he did not follow some certain other leader at some other time in the history of the party. It was a question of party entirely, nothing else. The good of the country was not considered by the article, though the writer of the article is one of the ablest editorial writers in the United States and is a high-minded, honorable man; but his enthusiasm over party was so great that the only thing he offered in favor of a man for an office was that he had done good service for the Democratic Party. That is one of the results of partisan control, of party-caucus control, of party government, of party responsibility, instead of individual responsibility.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Did this article discuss the question of the needs of the Postal Service?

Mr. NORRIS. Not once. It discussed the needs of the Democratic Party.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I suppose it did not pretend that the people would get any better service in the post offices if these Democrats were appointed?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; but it did contend that the Democratic Party would be better off.

Mr. POINDEXTER. As a matter of fact, it might have discussed the proposition of leaving out both Democrats and Republicans, so far as the postmasters were concerned, and let the post offices run without them. They would run a good deal better in most cases without any postmasters at all, because there is an expert, the assistant postmaster, who is a man who has technical knowledge and who has been promoted up to that place through his experience and his faithfulness in the service, and is paid a reasonable salary. As a rule, the postmaster, who is a politician, appointed through some such controversy as the Senator from Nebraska is describing, knows very little about the workings of the office and pays less attention to it. The chief function that he seems to perform in our political system is being the recipient of a political reward from one party or the other and drawing a salary. Fifteen million dollars a year could be saved to the Government, without impairing the Postal Service at all, by abolishing the office of postmaster altogether.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true; and I want to digress here to say that I am not charging this to the Democratic Party any more than I am to the Republican Party. The system is not

right. It all comes about from men putting party too high in the councils of the Government in matters of legislation. It is one of the results of party government and party responsibility rather than individual responsibility and independent action upon the part of every public official.

Mr. President, if we had a legislative body, I will say merely for the purpose of illustration, that contained 100 members, and there were 51 members of one party and 49 members of the other; the party in control gets into caucus; 26 men would be a majority of that caucus, and those 26 men would bind that party, would bind the 51 men, and thus pass the legislation. Where we are divided along party lines and caucus only along party lines, you may have a condition where 26 men out of a hundred are in favor of a bill, all the balance of the hundred being opposed to it, and yet those 26 men would pass that bill. Such a result would be perfectly feasible under the caucus system; and we have hundreds of illustrations where such things have actually taken place, where less than a majority of the body, although a majority of the dominant party, favoring a given proposition have been able to put it through the legislature. It is a very common thing, and is something that happens several times almost every year.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that here, in this place, where the law and the Constitution provide that official action shall be taken, every man ought to approach his vote without any strings tied to him and without any coercion from any source.

Something has been said about sinister influences in a caucus. Again I say I am not referring to any particular caucus, but to caucuses in general. Nine times out of ten a party that continually acts by caucus and keeps that practice up will eventually arrive at a stage where fewer men than you can number on the fingers of one hand will control every caucus where they meet in secret.

What would you think, Mr. President, of a caucus of a majority party being held here—it matters not what the party is—with the administration belonging to the same party, and the Postmaster General coming up to the Capitol, buttonholing Members, and saying to them: "I should like to have this" or "I should like to have that"? He makes no threat; he does not make any demand that is wrong on its face, perhaps, and he does not demand the caucus; but, after he talks with a few of the leaders, a paper commences to circulate; men sign it, and they go into the caucus, and, with closed doors, yes, and locked doors and drawn blinds, laws for the people are enacted, with every man having held up over his head the knowledge that 50 or 100 postmasters that he would like to name may be contingent on the vote he casts. There is no threat made, but Members of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, or of the State legislatures are, as a rule, wise enough, so that they can appreciate what will happen without being told in so many words what the result is going to be.

We know what happens when men are not "good" in their party and fail to yield their convictions. We know what patronage is. I knew it, Mr. President, in my own party; I had it used against me; I know its evils; and yet I am not able to go anywhere and put my finger on any individual and say, "I can prove thus and so in regard to it."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair.) Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me just now. Later I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to give the Senator a concrete case.

Mr. NORRIS. I prefer not to have it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I was about to say, Mr. President, when I was interrupted, that I know from my own personal experience what that means; and there is not a Senator here who does not understand it just as well as I do, although he may rise in his place and say, "Point out any particular case." I could point out several; but, as a rule, you only know that such and such a thing has happened. You know what the powers that be want when you go into that secret caucus; you know the man who controls the post offices, and you know what he would like to have you do. He has let you understand it, indirectly perhaps, but you are wise enough to understand, and you know that what you may want to ask for afterwards will depend upon your actions there. That is caucus control; that is party solidarity; that is party government; that is party responsibility. Why, party responsibility means that you will follow your leader anywhere, at any time, in any way. You lose your



individuality, and the means to bring that about more often used than any other is the caucus.

Mr. President, I had not intended to take so long a time in discussing the caucus. I desire now to take up the particular amendment which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has offered. In effect it provides that under the proposed rule, if it shall be adopted, no bill upon which a party has caucused can be considered under the rule. That is the intended effect of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, it is a difficult matter to draw an amendment that will prohibit the proposed rule from being used when caucuses are held on measures without doing more harm than good, and I believe the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa would be an injury rather than a benefit. Many Republicans have said to me—and the Senator from Iowa recently said it on the floor—that they are in favor of the substitute which I have offered if it could have added to it some such amendment as this, but they are opposed to it unless it has. Their reason is that they wish to take advantage of this opportunity to prohibit the use of the caucus in legislative matters. That is a worthy motive; but I should like to say to them that the caucus is on its last legs. We have seen in the case of this very bill that some of the members of the majority party refused to follow the dictates and the command of a caucus. The evil effects of the caucus system are becoming better known every day, and I believe it will not be long until the caucus will be known only in history. Personally I believe it is a relic of political barbarism. But let us see what would happen under this amendment if it were adopted. It reads:

This rule shall not apply to any bill, motion, resolution, or question upon which Senators belonging to any political party have held a caucus and passed a resolution or declaration in any form attempting to bind the members of such party in the Senate to vote in any particular way and where the application of the rule is moved by a Senator belonging to any such political party.

Let us suppose now that a bill is pending here and that the majority party caucuses, and that the minority party also hold a caucus, both of them attempting to instruct and to control their members and their votes—and that is the object of a caucus—what would happen if that were done? Who would be qualified to make the motion? Absolutely the entire Senate would be disqualified.

But if it be said by the Senator from Iowa, in defense of his amendment, that there is only one party that will caucus, I say in answer to that that it ought to be framed in such general terms—as his amendment is, of course—so that it would apply to all political parties. We have, however, so far as the consideration of the amendment is concerned, as much right to suppose that one party will hold a caucus as another. Let us suppose, then, that we had a bill here in relation to which one of the parties caucused. Now, any member of that party would be disqualified under the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if it were adopted, from proposing to consider a bill under the proposed rule. It says—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. Shortly, but not until I finish this sentence. It says that the proposed rule shall not apply—

where the application of the rule is moved by a Senator belonging to any such political party.

So that no one belonging to a political party which had met in caucus would dare make the motion; he could not make it. Now, suppose there were a few Members on the other side who were opposed to having this rule apply to some bill, and they wanted to filibuster, let us say. They could get together and hold a caucus. Under the proposed amendment the caucus does not have to be participated in by all the members of the political party in the body. The amendment provides that the rule shall not apply to questions upon which "Senators belonging to any political party have held a caucus." Suppose half a dozen Members of the other side should get together and pass a resolution solemnly declaring that it was the sense of the members of their party that some bill, whatever it might be, should not be passed, and that "all members of the party are bound by this resolution." Then nobody would be qualified on that side in that party to make the motion. So, if a few Members in each party were opposed to taking up a bill, under this amendment they could take action that would disqualify any Member of the body from making a motion to take it up. Now I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I suppose there is no form of words that can be used upon any subject that is not capable of being misapplied. I think, however, that we ought to look upon this amendment as it relates to matters as they generally transpire. The Senators who desire to prevent a filibuster will

be the Senators who will move for the application of this rule. It is not a majority that ordinarily filibusters, but a minority numerically, so that in its ordinary application this motion could only be made by a Senator who belonged to the political party which has held the caucus and which desires that debate shall be brought to an end.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, if a caucus were held, he could not make the motion.

Mr. CUMMINS. No Senator who desired to prolong the debate indefinitely would move for an application of this rule. That would only be done by a Senator who would want debate to be closed. Now, what Senator would want debate to be closed? A Senator belonging to a majority of the Senate and to the party that has held the caucus. In that event the rule would not apply; that is to say, unless it were shown that the caucus had not been held and the order made the rule would not apply. So I can not conceive of how it could practically be misused. While I know that theoretically Senators would divide themselves into groups or knots—

Mr. NORRIS. Who could make the motion now in connection with the shipping bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senators who would make the motion are Senators from the majority.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. CUMMINS. But they could not make it, because they had held a caucus.

Mr. NORRIS. The rule would not apply if it were shown that they had been in caucus.

Mr. CUMMINS. Exactly.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, suppose that I and two or three other Senators should get together on this side and hold a caucus. We could preclude the Senator from Iowa from making the motion, could we not?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; the Senator from Nebraska could make the motion, but the rule could not be made applicable, because a political party had held a caucus upon it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the objections I have offered are not the only ones which can be suggested, although I believe they are valid objections. It only shows how nearly impossible it is to draw a rule that will be workable. Let us see what else would happen under this rule.

How are we going to demonstrate the fact respecting the existence of a caucus? Suppose we had such a rule, and I made a motion to consider a bill under the rule, and the question as to whether or not a caucus had been held was raised. That would have to be determined. This proposed rule is designed to prevent filibustering and delay; but the first thing we run up against is an outside question, the determination of which of itself very naturally means delay. The Senator seeks to meet that contingency. He realizes that it is often a difficult thing to say whether there has been a caucus held or not, as defined in the first part of his amendment. So he adds in his amendment:

The fact respecting the existence of such caucus, resolution, or declaration shall be determined in the first instance by a committee of five Senators appointed by the presiding officer, who shall report within two days, and upon its report by the Senate without debate.

When the question is raised, this proposed amendment says that the existence of this caucus or the passage of such a resolution must be determined in the first instance by a committee. Well, who will determine it in the second instance? What does that mean?

Mr. CUMMINS. It means the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to get the Senator's explanation.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is exactly what it means—in the first place by a committee, and then by the Senate without debate.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I did not take it that way. It is to be determined in the first instance by a committee, and that committee must report in two days. Why, Mr. President, if such a question were submitted, and an attempt had been made to hold a caucus in violation of the rule, instances would often arise where it would take two weeks for a committee working diligently to determine whether, under the terms of this rule, there had been a caucus. In other words, this rule provides on its very face, it seems to me, its own destruction, and makes it practically unworkable. This committee have to report, it is true, in two days. Whether they are able to report in two days or two weeks depends upon the difficulty of the matter that is before them. It may be easy, and it may be almost impossible to determine.

Shall report within two days, and upon its report by the Senate without debate.

I hardly get just exactly what that language means, the last line and a half, but I assume it means that when the report comes in it shall be decided without debate. They may ask additional time. The very report on its face may show that



they have not gone to the bottom of it. It may show on its very face that they need additional time, and you must either give it to them and get the facts or pass on it without having the facts.

I would not care about the investigation; I would be perfectly willing that that should be made; but you must remember all the time that this is a rule intended to limit debate, intended to bring these interminable and everlasting discussions to some end some time in our lives; and yet we are going to appoint a committee to go outside and make an investigation as to whether a caucus was held and as to whether certain resolutions were passed at that caucus. While it is not provided for here, I think we would have to pass a resolution every time giving them authority to summon witnesses, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to compel Senators and others to testify. You could not get along without that. At least it would leave it all with the fellows who held the caucus; and while I know that the Senator is acting in the best of faith—I am not questioning that—I take it that if this amendment were adopted it would practically nullify the rules.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the Senator from Nebraska feel that if the committee provided for in my amendment should be unable to report, and the matter were then submitted to the Senate without debate, a majority of the Members of the Senate would know whether or not a caucus of this sort had been held?

Mr. NORRIS. Probably; but the Senator knows—he is too good a lawyer not to know—that when you start out to try a lawsuit you may know a whole lot of things that you can not prove, and a great many things that it is very difficult to prove, and a great many other things that it takes a good deal of time to prove. We know about these influences that control caucuses, but a man can get up with perfect safety and say, "I challenge you to cite an instance where, in this particular caucus, anybody used any influence." If you know it, you would not tell it, because you have gotten it confidentially. We know it in this case; it has been announced on the floor of the Senate; but if this rule were adopted, I take it that would not always occur. We would not know, in such a way that we could put it in writing or testify to it, just exactly what resolution they had passed, and hence we would be unable to decide whether there had been such a caucus or such an attempt to control the vote of Members as would disqualify the bill under this rule from being considered under its terms.

Mr. President, I believe that if the substitute I have offered should be enacted into law, there never would arise any difficulty about its enforcement. If men are going to hold caucuses, they will still continue to hold them until they are condemned more strongly than they have been by the people. As I said a while ago, I do not believe it will be long until they will be banished entirely from all legislative bodies. But I would not if I could prevent any man or any set of men from holding a party caucus. I would not take away that right if I could, although if I could get an amendment here—and I believe, in the amendment to the rules that I have offered, I have come nearer to it, though not completely—that would prevent a man who was bound by a caucus from voting to take up a bill under this rule I should be glad to do it. But if you undertake to draw the rule you will find that it is almost an impossibility to do it, and I have reached the conclusion that we must leave it to the honor of each individual and let him decide it for himself; and personally I do not believe we would run any risk if we did it.

For these reasons I shall feel constrained to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. With the point of view of the Senator from Nebraska I have some sympathy. I believe it would be better for the country if each Member of the Senate of the United States, for himself, upon public questions, and upon honest, sincere argument upon the floor, would determine his vote, so that the action of the Senate would represent in truth the sober, honest judgment of each and every man upon the floor, uninfluenced by any mere party interest or by merely the question of party solidarity or of any undue desire to merely gratify his party associates. But we all know about these agreements, either express or implied, that move either side of the aisle. The Senator from Iowa, of course, can not and will not deny that the word is passed around to get solidarity among the Members on his own side, so that in the votes upon this bill, and even upon the various points of order, there has been the most complete unanimity of the Members on his side of the aisle, trying to get some advantage over the opposing party on

this side of the aisle. The Senator wraps himself in a cloak of virtuous indignation when he speaks against the caucus, as if there were, in fact, no caucus upon his side of the aisle, notwithstanding that there is the most complete agreement arrived at with regard to the course of conduct moving the membership on that side of the aisle, and beyond that no caucus can go.

The Senator may say that it is a voluntary agreement. It is voluntary in a certain sense. It is voluntary in the sense that Members on his side of the aisle do not feel willing, when they find a preponderance of opinion favoring a certain course of conduct on that side of the aisle, to go against party colleagues and associates; and therefore, by that procedure having arrived at party solidarity on that side of the aisle, the Senator argues with extreme zeal against any party solidarity on this side of the aisle.

The franker, more open, and more decent method, I think, is to go into a caucus room and there arrive at a party policy, determine what is to the best interests of the country and the best interests of the party, and then and there agree to merge minor personal differences and establish a caucus action and stand firmly by it. In my opinion it will not be many years in this country when we shall have a change from the caucus action, because we will have ultimately in this country a preferential ballot; and when we have a preferential ballot we will do away with minority rule, we will do away with minority nominations, we will do away with minority elections or plurality elections. Then the Members who come to this floor will in fact, and not colorably, represent the majority of the people in the States from which they are accredited. When they do represent the people they will find themselves representing groups of people, representing Democrats, representing other parties that will be allied with them in greater or less degree, and representing ultimately all the people of a State, and feeling that sense of responsibility which will make a Member on this floor in fact and in truth undertake to represent the best interests of all the people of his State and all the people of this great Republic. So long as we have these strongly drawn party lines it is the wisest and the best thing for a party having party responsibility to have a conference of its own members, and in that conference or caucus to work out the personal differences, to argue the matter with perfect freedom among themselves, and arrive at a party conclusion.

Senators continually speak of the party caucus as being a secret party caucus. In fact, there is no secrecy in a party caucus on either side of the Chamber, any more than there is secrecy in the so-called executive sessions, which, under a seal of profound secrecy, are published at great length in the morning papers every day after these sessions are held. More than that, it is a part of the Democratic caucus action that the votes of the members of the caucus shall be given to the press.

I have desired, myself, to have an open party caucus. There is nothing in the party caucus that I would not be willing to make public. I think there is nothing that occurs in a party caucus that is not made public. You can not get half a dozen Senators together and retain anything secret among them. You can not get 53 Senators together and have any hope of secrecy, and to attempt to have it secret is absurd and ridiculous.

Senators talk about a caucus dominating and overwhelming the private individual judgment and controlling men against their will to do this or that. My answer to that is that when I enter into a caucus I find myself sometimes in the majority and sometimes in the minority; something is yielded to my opinions, I yield something to the opinions of others; but when the conclusion is reached I give my voluntary assent and my cordial support to the party action. I do that for the benefit of the party; I do that for the benefit of the legislation, in order to arrive at some adjustment, and in order to prevent a minority on that side of the Chamber entering into a collusive agreement with a small faction on this side of the Chamber, and appropriating the power to conduct the affairs of this Government contrary to the will of the people who put the majority on this side of the Chamber.

It is an old rule of military strategy to divide and conquer. You will not be permitted to divide and conquer the Democratic Party on this side of the Chamber with my consent. There are Members on your side of the Chamber who entertain views with regard to public questions almost identical with my own, yet they rarely find themselves able to break away from their environment, even when they feel strongly upon a question, and vote with those on this side of the Chamber with whom they may be in accord on certain economic questions.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.



Mr. CLAPP. I will tell the Senator why that is not possible. It is because instead of those on that side who are somewhat in harmony with some on this side coming together with them that particular force on that side yields to a caucus, and surrenders—and I do not use that term in any reprehensible sense—that particular conviction which is in harmony with the group here; and that is the trouble with the caucus system.

Take, for instance, the Trade Commission bill, which was worked out in the Senate through an equation. Of all the measures that the Democratic Party will have to its credit in the next campaign, the one measure which no Democrat will have to stand for one moment to defend is the Trade Commission bill, because that, freed from the trammels of a caucus, was worked out upon this floor, and those who did look upon certain public questions alike had the opportunity to come together without any caucus intervening between them and produce a bill which will stand to the credit of the Democratic Party.

Mr. OWEN. There was a considerable measure of sentiment on either side of the Chamber with regard to that measure, and therefore it was possible to deal with it in that way; but where the lines are very sharply drawn it is impossible to do that. The time will come, in my opinion, when that will be the rule, and I hope to see it speedily come. It has not yet altogether arrived.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon another interruption?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. Take the present shipping bill: There are a number of Senators on that side who are opposed to the corporation feature of that bill. There are a number of Senators on this side who are opposed to the corporation feature of that bill. We believe that it is fundamental; that that feature destroys the Government ownership and control of the ships that it is proposed to build and purchase. If those on that side were as free from the caucus as they were in the case of the Trade Commission bill, those who are opposed to the corporation feature could then come together, and I believe give this country a shipping bill that in the end would redound to the credit of the present administration.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, if the sentiments on that side of the Chamber were altogether like the sentiments of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], I would be opposed to any caucus on this side of the Chamber. Unfortunately that is not the case.

On yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] made a very elaborate argument on Rule XXII, on the ground that the previous question could not be moved in the Senate of the United States, and on the ground that Rule XXII provides as follows:

When a question is pending no motion shall be received but—

- (1) To adjourn.
- (2) To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.
- (3) To take a recess.
- (4) To proceed to the consideration of executive business.
- (5) To lay on the table.
- (6) To postpone indefinitely.
- (7) To postpone to a day certain.
- (8) To commit.
- (9) To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

The Senator argued with great zeal that no motion could be received but the motions which are here enumerated without what he was pleased to designate as revolution, without what he was pleased to declare a destruction and overthrow of the rules of the Senate, on the ground that the words "previous question" had been omitted from this rule in 1806, and that, the Senate being a continuous body, the rules were continuous, and that the rule of 1806 had continued through 108 years up to this day, and that we were still bound by the rule of 1806, and that we could not without revolution change this rule, even by a majority vote of the Senate. The theory that a majority vote of the Senate can not change it is because you can only change it, under the rules, by certain forms, and when you raise the question of changing this rule, that question is itself debatable, and an organized filibuster against it will prevent any change of this rule; and therefore, in effect, that the majority of this body can not change its own rules. He challenges the idea that the rules of the Senate of the Sixty-fourth Congress are not fixed by the rules of the Sixty-third Congress, and insists that the rules of the Sixty-third Congress are made by the rules of the Sixty-second Congress, and so back to the year 1806; and when I ventured to ask him how, in the face of a filibuster which he was taking an active part in conducting on this

floor, we might change these rules, the Senator evaded the question in the first place, and when I pressed the question he answered with facetiousness and disappeared behind his own humor. He did not answer the question. He could not answer the question, because, under the right of an organized filibuster a minority can prevent Rule XXII being changed if that rule is, as they contend, not amenable to change by the open action of the Senate.

I should not hesitate one moment in moving the previous question on this floor, and I should expect when it was moved on this floor that the majority of the Senators on this floor would sustain the motion on the ground that common sense and common decency, recognizing the right of the majority to rule this body and to make the rules of this body were involved in that proposition.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understood the Senator to say, or my inference was from the Senator's remarks, that he believed that the caucus action should be binding. Was I right in that?

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is diverting me from the argument I am making on the previous question, and I decline to be diverted now. I have already passed from the question of caucus. I will come back to that after I have finished with the previous question, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall be glad to renew my question at that time.

Mr. OWEN. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator then.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate again to the reason why the Senate of the United States in 1806 omitted the previous question from their printed or written rules. There were only 17 States at that time. There were only 34 Senators at that time—a small group, with a small number of bills before them. The statutes at that time were almost negligible. The various States were connected only by the stagecoach. They had but little in common among themselves. This great country was not then gridironed, as it is now, by hundreds of thousands of miles of steam railroad lines and steamboat lines and connected together by telephone lines to the extent of millions and millions of private telephones, connecting the whole country intimately together. The business of the country at that time was small. These gentlemen—and they were gentlemen—meeting together, had occasion to invoke the previous question only three times in 17 years. Therefore, in recasting the rules, it was regarded by them as being unnecessary to have the previous question, because no man abused the right of freedom of debate. The previous question is necessary only when you have a large legislative body transacting important business, dealing with many public questions of importance, and it is necessary only where men no longer show the reciprocal courtesy which the courtesy or freedom of debate ought to inspire.

The necessity for cloture or the previous question has grown more and more important. It was presented at various times in the past by many distinguished Republicans, as by Mr. Edmunds and Mr. Morrill, of Maine. There are various forms of modified cloture that were suggested by Mr. Windom in 1878, by Mr. Anthony in 1878, by Mr. Allison in 1879, by Mr. Edmunds again in 1882, by Mr. Hale in 1883, upon certain matters; by Mr. Hale again in 1883, and a similar proposal by Mr. Harris in 1884; by Mr. Allison in 1885, by Mr. Frye in 1886, by Mr. Cameron in 1887, by Mr. Edmunds in 1887, by Mr. Chandler in 1890. As the years went on these proposals for cloture grew more and more particular and grew more and more intense. Mr. Chandler, for instance, proposed this:

Resolved, That the following be adopted as a standing rule of the Senate:

"Whenever a bill or resolution reported from a committee is under consideration the Senate may, on motion, to be acted on without debate or dilatory motions, order that on a day, not less than six days after the passage of the order, debate shall cease and the Senate proceed to dispose of the bill or resolution; and when said day shall arrive, at 3 o'clock the vote shall be forthwith taken without debate or dilatory motions upon any amendments to the bill or resolution and upon the passage thereof."

Mr. Chandler, I believe, at one time was one of the members of the Cabinet representing the Republicans in the Cabinet, as well as having represented the Republicans on the floor of the Senate Chamber, until he was run over by the Boston & Maine Railroad, an incident of a tragical character which I venture to refer to at this moment, in 1890.

Mr. CLAPP. May I ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. OWEN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.



Mr. CLAPP. Is it not a fact that when that Senator was urging that rule he was for the steam-roller method to rule the minority in the Senate?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, Mr. President, I can not answer whether the Senator was or was not a member of the steam roller. The majority always tries to exercise its authority. If it does not do so, it ought to be kicked out of authority and become a minority, as it deserves to be. A majority that has not intelligence enough or enough virility to exercise control ought to be made a minority; it does not deserve to rule if it has not enough manhood to exercise the power.

Mr. CLAPP. That is true; but it turns out that the group of which the Senator at that time was a part, while nominally a majority, was not in fact a majority of the Senate.

Mr. OWEN. I shall not undertake to analyze that relationship, because it is not before me and would divert me from the presentation of the Republican authority which I am now offering on the previous question.

In 1898, August 1, Mr. Blair, quite a distinguished Republican Senator, submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to report a rule within four days providing for the incorporation of the previous question or some method for limiting and closing debate in the parliamentary procedure of the Senate.

Mr. Blair did not do that without some cause. Doubtless he felt that a majority party in control of the Senate ought to be allowed to exercise the powers given to them by the people of the United States, and Mr. Blair was right about it. But these various Republican authorities that I have cited are not all. Here comes in Senator Hoar, a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, August 9, 1890, and submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding as follows:

"When any bill or resolution shall have been under consideration for a reasonable time it shall be in order for any Senator to demand that debate thereon be closed. If such demand be seconded by a majority of the Senators present, the question shall forthwith be taken thereon without further debate, and the pending measure shall take precedence of all other business whatever. If the Senate shall decide to close debate, the question shall be put upon the pending amendments, upon amendments of which notice shall then be given, and upon the measure in its successive stages, according to the rules of the Senate, but without further debate, except that every Senator who may desire shall be permitted to speak upon the measure not more than once and not exceeding 30 minutes.

"After such demand shall have been made by any Senator, no other motion shall be in order until the same shall have been voted upon by the Senate, unless the same shall fail to be seconded.

"After the Senate shall have decided to close debate, no motion shall be in order but a motion to adjourn or to take a recess, when such motion shall be seconded by a majority of the Senate. When either of said motions shall have been lost, or shall have failed of a second, it shall not be in order to renew the same until one Senator shall have spoken upon the pending measure or one vote on the same shall have intervened."

That was not all. On the 12th of August, 1890, Mr. Edmunds—and Mr. Edmunds is regarded also as a man of sound mind, a man learned in the law, learned in parliamentary practice, a man of very great intellectual distinction—proposed the following order:

*Ordered*, That during the consideration of House bill 9416, entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," no Senator shall speak more than once, and not longer than five minutes, on or in respect of any one item in said bill, etc.

All appeals pending the matter aforesaid shall be determined at once, and without debate.

Mr. Blair, August 12, 1890, submitted the following resolution for consideration:

*Resolved*, That the following rule be adopted to fix the limit of debate, namely:

"RULE.—When a proposition has been under debate two days and not less than four hours, which shall be determined by the Presiding Officer without debate, it shall be in order to move the previous question, unless the Senate shall otherwise fix the time when debate shall cease and the vote be taken; and in any case arising under this rule the Senator in charge of the measure shall have one hour in which to close the debate.

"During the last 14 days preceding the time fixed by law or by concurrent resolution passed by the Senate for the end of the session, a majority of the Senate may close the debate at any time, subject to the right of the Senator in charge of the measure; and any motion for the previous question, or to limit debate and to fix the time for the vote to be taken, shall cease in one hour and be subject to the Anthony rule."

On August 12, 1890, Mr. Quay, then a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, submitted the following resolution for consideration, which was ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That during the present session of Congress the Senate will not take up for consideration any legislative business other than the pending bill (the tariff bill) and general appropriation bills, bills relating to public buildings and public lands, and Senate or concurrent resolutions.

*Resolved*, That the consideration of all bills other than such as are mentioned in the foregoing resolution is hereby postponed until the session of Congress to be held on the first Monday in December, 1890.

*Resolved*, That the vote on the pending bill and all amendments thereto shall be taken on the 30th day of August instant at 2 o'clock p. m., the voting to continue without further debate until the consideration of the bill and the amendments is completed.

On August 16, 1890, Mr. Quay again made a proposal for the limitation of debate:

*Ordered*, 1. That during the present session of Congress the Senate will not take up for consideration any legislative business other than the pending bill (H. R. 9416), conference reports, general appropriation bills, pension bills, bills relating to the public lands, to the United States courts, to the Postal Service, to agriculture and forestry, to public buildings, and Senate or concurrent resolutions.

*Ordered*, 2. That the consideration of all bills other than such as are mentioned in the foregoing order is hereby postponed until the session of Congress to be held on the first Monday of December, 1890.

*Ordered*, 3. That a vote shall be taken on the bill (H. R. 9416) now under consideration in the Senate and upon amendments then pending, without further debate, on the 30th day of August, 1890, the voting to commence at 2 o'clock p. m. on said day and continue on that and subsequent days, to the exclusion of all other business, until the bill and pending amendments are finally disposed of.

And that it was proposed to modify, for the foregoing stated purpose, the following rules, namely: VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXV, and XL.

*Ordered*, That the notice, with the proposed orders, be printed.

The purpose of that was to put an end to the debate on the tariff bill.

On August 18, 1890, Mr. Quay urged a similar rule for the purpose of limiting debate on the tariff bill.

On December 23, 1890, Mr. Aldrich, long recognized as the leader of the Republican Party—

gave notice, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XL, that he would move certain amendments to the rules, which would modify Rules VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXXV, and XL, and for that purpose he would hereafter submit the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That for the remainder of this session the rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto the following:

"When any bill, resolution, or other question shall have been under consideration for a reasonable time it shall be in order for any Senator to demand that debate thereon be closed. On such demand no debate shall be in order, and pending such demand no other motion, except one motion to adjourn, shall be made. If such demand be seconded by a majority of the Senators present, the question shall forthwith be taken thereon without debate. If the Senate shall decide to close debate on the bill, resolution, or other question, the measure shall take precedence of all other business whatever, and the question shall be put upon the amendments, if any, then pending, and upon the measure in its successive stages, according to the rules of the Senate, but without further debate, except that every Senator who may desire shall be permitted to speak upon the measure, including all amendments, not more than once, and not exceeding 30 minutes.

"After the Senate shall have decided to close debate as herein provided, no motion shall be in order but a motion to adjourn or to take a recess when such motion shall be seconded by a majority of the Senate. When either of said motions shall have been lost, or shall have failed of a second, it shall not be in order to renew the same until one Senator shall have spoken upon the pending measure, or one vote upon the same shall have intervened.

"Pending proceedings under the foregoing rule no proceeding in respect of a quorum shall be in order until it shall have appeared on a division or on the taking of the yeas and nays that a quorum is not present and voting.

"Pending proceedings under the foregoing rule, all questions of order, whether on appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate, and no obstructive or dilatory motion or proceeding of any kind shall be in order.

"For the foregoing stated purposes the following rules, namely, VII, VIII, IX, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXV, and XL, are modified."

*Ordered*, That the proposed resolution be printed.

On December 29, 1890, Mr. Aldrich, pursuant to notice given on the 23d, submitted a resolution, which was ordered printed in the form which I have just presented to the Senate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has shown several attempts to amend the rules of the Senate so as to limit debate, beginning, I think, as early as 1872.

Mr. OWEN. As early as 1841.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well, since 1841. Have any of those attempts been successful?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, no. Oh, no minority filibuster can defeat them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At any rate, the Senate has gone along since 1841—

Mr. OWEN. Yes; under the rule of the minority filibuster.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. About 70 years, and the Senate has not amended the rule in this respect?

Mr. OWEN. Not yet.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not yet.

Mr. OWEN. But it is about to amend it now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Although there have been a great many attempts to do it.

Mr. OWEN. They are going to be amended now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator says so, but I would rather have the Senator's view as a historian than his view as a prophet now.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator will have both.



Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think his view as a historian will differ from that as a prophet when we get through.

I was going to ask the Senator whether he does not think the failure of the Senate for 70 years to make this amendment is entitled to greater weight in considering this question now than the futile attempt of a Senator now and then during the course of 70 years to make the amendment?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, Mr. President, under the interpretation of the rules by the Senator from Utah, who, I take it, is in strict accord with the Senator from New York [Mr. Root], they having had a caucus, you can not amend the rules. Under their view the rules of 1806 are perpetual and can never be changed so long as a vigorous minority objects.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. It occurs to me the mere fact that Senators for 100 years neglected to do what was their duty in order to cut off interminable debate ought hardly be pleaded now as a justification for further neglect along that line.

Mr. OWEN. There was quite a vigorous effort made on the part of Senator Aldrich and the Senators behind him to modify these rules. I shall not go into the debate except to point out that it will be found in the debates of 1891, beginning in January, where vote after vote was taken and where a filibuster was organized by the Democrats against a change of the rules.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator if he is filibustering?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, no, Mr. President; I am simply making a few observations on the need of changing the rules and putting an end to filibustering. I am merely occupying the floor that would be otherwise occupied by the filibusterers. [Laughter and applause in the galleries.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will please suspend. Under the rules of the Senate the occupants of the galleries are not permitted to give any expression of their approval or disapproval of any remarks made by a Senator.

Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Oklahoma tell us what he is reading from?

Mr. OWEN. He is reading from the Record of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is, the Senator is reading from his own speech?

Mr. OWEN. I am reading from the abstract from the Record made by the legislative reference bureau under my instruction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which the Senator put in the other day?

Mr. OWEN. And which it is impossible to make the Senator from Utah give attention to unless by reading it to him in person. For that reason he is reading it to him in person.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask the Senator whether it is the same matter he read the other day?

Mr. OWEN. No; it was not read. It was inserted in the Record. I am now reading it, and I am reading it in order to bring it to the attention of the Senate and the country, and I will do it on more than one occasion until the country realizes what is being done to public business by the filibuster on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. LIPPITT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator is anxious to have an audience, I think he should have it. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit that no Senator can rise in the time of another Senator and make any such suggestion as that.

Mr. OWEN. I make the point of order that the Senator from Massachusetts is out of order; that I did not yield to him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. OWEN. For a question.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was only going to ask the Senator whether he would kindly tell us about how long he intends to continue to read these interesting articles, that I might make my plans accordingly.

Mr. OWEN. I should say about 20 minutes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Thank you.

Mr. OWEN. I have no purpose to hold the floor longer than to emphasize the Republican authority which I have in favor of cloture or the previous question or the limitation of debate in this body.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not a fact, I will ask the Senator, that not one of the proposed amendments or orders ever was passed or became a part of the rules of this body?

Mr. OWEN. I have already said to the Senator that a minority filibuster can prevent the modification of the rules, if his interpretation of the rule prevails, and therefore I say that his interpretation of the rules is unreasonable and absurd and self-contradictory if majority rule is to control this body.

No; they have not been adopted, because a robust minority prevented the majority from establishing a change of the rule, and I do not care whether the minority was Democratic or not. It is both a Democratic principle and a Republican principle in this country that a majority shall rule, and when Democrats on this side assert minority rule, and when Republicans on that side assert minority rule, I think the origin does not dignify the argument. The argument stands independent of the authority—that the majority has a right to rule. I am in favor of exercising that right, and I am in favor of doing it now, not to-morrow.

Mr. GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, on the 14th of October, 1893, on page 2504, made this proposal:

When any bill or resolution reported from a standing or select committee is under consideration, if a majority of the entire membership of the Senate submit a request in writing, through the Chair, that debate close, such papers shall be referred to the Committee on Rules, and it shall be the duty of said committee within a period not exceeding five days from the date of said reference to report an order naming a day and hour when a vote shall be taken, and action upon said report shall be had without amendment or debate.

Senator Hoar made a similar proposal to this effect in 1893, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1637:

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding the following:

"When any bill or resolution shall have been under consideration for more than one day it shall be in order for any Senator to demand that debate thereon be closed. If such demand be seconded by a majority of the Senators present, the question shall forthwith be taken thereon without further debate, and the pending measure shall take precedence of all other business whatever."

And so forth.

Senator Hoar, Senator GALLINGER, Senator LODGE, Senator PLATT, and Senator ROOT, all of them are on record for limiting debate. Here is a resolution proposed by Senator Orville H. PLATT, of Connecticut, introduced September 21, 1893, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1636:

Whenever any bill or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business the Presiding Officer shall, upon the written request of a majority of the Senators, fix a day and hour, and notify the Senate thereof, when general debate shall cease thereon, which time shall not be less than five days from the submission of such request, and he shall also fix a subsequent day and hour, and notify the Senate thereof, when the vote shall be taken on the bill or resolution and any amendment thereto without further debate, the time for taking the vote to be not more than two days later than the time when general debate is to cease, and in the interval between the closing of general debate and the taking of the vote no Senator shall speak more than five minutes nor more than once upon the same proposition.

Senator Vest, of Missouri, in 1893 introduced the following resolution, the most moderate form of terminating so-called debate:

Amendment intended to be proposed to the rules of the Senate, namely, add to Rule I the following section:

"SEC. 2. Whenever any bill, motion, or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business and the same shall have been debated on divers days, amounting in all to 30, it shall be in order for any Senator to move that a time be fixed for the taking of a vote upon such bill, motion, or resolution, and such motion shall not be amendable or debatable, but shall be immediately put."

And so forth.

Now, Mr. President, Senator ROOT, on the 6th of April, 1911, submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to report for the consideration of the Senate a rule or rules to secure more effective control by the Senate over its procedure, and especially over its procedure upon conference reports and upon bills which have been passed by the House and have been favorably reported in the Senate. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 47, pt. 1, p. 107.)

I have quoted these very distinguished Republican leaders in order to call the attention of the country to the fact that Senator ROOT, Senator Gallinger, Senator Lodge, Senator Orville H. PLATT, Senator Quay, Senator Edmunds, and the various Senators whose names I have quoted have demanded the right of the limitation of debate in this body; and therefore, since it has been demanded in this way by the leaders on that side of the Chamber and the leaders on this side of the Chamber,



under the broad ground that the majority has a right to rule in this body, no further argument is necessary. Even under the unanimous consent of the Senate the change of the rule ought to be recognized. Indeed, I think no change of the rule is necessary. The only thing which is necessary is to carry out these rules in the spirit of the rules. The only thing necessary is to recognize the constitutional right of one-fifth of the Members of this body to demand the yeas and nays upon any question pending, and no sophistry, no intellectual quibbling or crafty argument, can abate the force of that language of the Constitution of the United States, which says that "the yeas and nays," being ordered by "one-fifth of those present," shall be "entered on the Journal." You can not enter them on the Journal without taking the vote. That constitutional right carries with it the right to take a vote at the time it is demanded and not at some future, delayed, or refused time. It is refused by an organized filibuster—organized not with a caucus, perhaps, but, what is worse than a caucus, without even debate among themselves. They meet in the cloakroom and check up man by man to conduct an organized filibuster, so that every step is known to every man in the filibuster. It is an organized conspiracy against the sovereign power of the people of this Republic, denying them the right to rule, denying them the right to speak and to make effective their will through the majority of their chosen representatives in this body.

Mr. President, I shall from time to time submit some further observations upon the question of the limitation of debate in this body and on the previous question. I now move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, and I demand the yeas and nays on that proposal.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma moves to lay on the table the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. The Senator from Iowa suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shively
Bankhead	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Gore	Norris	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Hollis	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Hughes	Owen	Smoot
Burton	James	Page	Stone
Camden	Johnson	Penrose	Sutherland
Catron	Jones	Perkins	Swanson
Chilton	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Clapp	Kern	Poindexter	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Vardaman
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Walsh
Culberson	Lewis	Root	Warren
Cummins	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Weeks
Dillingham	Lodge	Shafroth	White
du Pont	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Fall	McLean	Shields	Works

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], on account of illness.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], on account of sickness. He is paired for the day until 6 o'clock with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has moved to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. REED. Upon that motion I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANSDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of illness. He is paired until 6 o'clock this evening with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

## YEAS—45.

Ashurst	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Reed	Stone
Chilton	Lewis	Robinson	Swanson
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Thompson
Gore	Myers	Sheppard	Tillman
Hollis	Newlands	Shields	Walsh
Hughes	Norris	Shively	White
James	Overman	Simmons	Williams
Johnson	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	
Kern	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	
Lane	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	

## NAYS—47.

Bankhead	Colt	Kenyon	Root
Borah	Crawford	La Follette	Sherman
Brady	Cummins	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Bristow	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Burleigh	Fall	McLean	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Nelson	Townsend
Camden	Goff	O'Gorman	Vardaman
Catron	Gronna	Page	Warren
Clapp	Hardwick	Penrose	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Perkins	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Poindexter	

## NOT VOTING—4.

Chamberlain	Oliver	Sterling	Thornton
-------------	--------	----------	----------

So the Senate refused to lay the amendment of Mr. CUMMINS on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I desire to ask unanimous consent to report the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. If I can yield to the Senator for that purpose without losing the floor, Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may do so by unanimous consent. The Chair hears no objection.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GORE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 987) thereon.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], in discussing the then existing situation in the Senate, caused by the Republican opposition to the shipping bill, said that extraordinary conditions demanded extraordinary remedies. He was considering the subject from the standpoint of what might justly be done to remedy what he regarded as an extraordinary condition.

I want to consider that situation, not viewed from the standpoint that it was an extraordinary condition but from the standpoint that what was occurring then was in itself an extraordinary remedy, for the extraordinary condition, to my mind, existed prior to that situation, and the dramatic events that were occurring here were in themselves an extraordinary remedy for unwise and unjustifiable attempts to conduct the business of this body in extraordinary and unusual ways.

The Congress of the United States, and the Senate in particular, may reasonably be regarded as a piece of legislative machinery; machinery that, within the limits of what it is designed for and is capable of performing, is efficient and works with creditable satisfaction; but, like all machines, if asked to put through a larger output than it was designed for, if run at a higher speed than it is intended for, it begins to creak and groan and show signs of distress. The gears grind and the belts slip. What has been undertaken in connection with the legislation of this session is to put through the senatorial machine a larger volume of business than it is possible to properly consider, formulate, and enact into law in the necessarily limited period of time of a session which expires by law on the 4th of next March.

Primarily, the business of this session of Congress is to pass appropriation bills. This in itself is a very great and a very important undertaking. It is one to which more time should be given than is frequently the case. The records of past Congresses, I think, show conclusively that these great appropriation bills are often neglected; that they have generally failed to receive the amount of consideration in this body that their importance entitles them to. That is particularly the case during these alternate terms of Congress, which are known as the short sessions, beginning on the first Monday of December and expiring, necessarily on the 4th day of the succeeding March. It has often happened—I think the records will show it has usually happened—that the consideration of these appropriation bills gets pushed over to the last few days of such sessions. Other subjects are taken up in the first days of these sessions; the Senate becomes interested in them; they open up wider fields for discussion than was at first expected, perhaps, and by the time they have finally been disposed of the remaining time is so short that in the natural desire of Senators to finish the business of the session and in the necessity that exists for the disposal of these sub-



jects in some way they are rushed through an impatient Senate more inclined to hasten their passage than to analyze their details. That they are important I think nobody will be disposed to deny. The Government of the United States is a great business organization. Even in these modern days of great commercial undertakings it is the largest business organization in this country. I presume it is the largest business organization in the world. Its annual income and outgo are now considerably more than a billion dollars a year, and the regular appropriation bills of this session, I understand, will provide for even a larger total expenditure than that enormous sum.

The first necessity of every business management is to provide for the prompt and orderly management of its finances. Obligations that are due under the customs of business at fixed times have to be met at that time. Failure to do so results in trouble and disaster. And what is true of private business is also true of governmental business. Sitting as a board of directors of the United States this body has no more important duty than to carefully supervise and provide for its financial arrangements. Extravagance, waste, and inefficiency mean a burden upon the people. In the magnitude and complexity of governmental administration they may not be aware of the causes that produce it. They may not fully appreciate the situation or perhaps locate the blame, but the duty exists, nevertheless, in this body to give this important subject complete, ample, and unhurried consideration. That necessarily can not be done when in a short session, such as the one we are now in the midst, other important and fundamental subjects of legislation are allowed to push the subject of finances into the crowded days at the end of a strictly limited session.

When the attempt, therefore, is made, as it has been made in this session of Congress, to interfere with the necessary and legitimate work of the session by introducing other important subjects of legislation the extraordinary situation arises here which occurs when any machine is pushed beyond its reasonable and proper limits. That is the extraordinary situation in which we find ourselves to-day. There has been an attempt to enact at this short session of Congress more legislation than could be properly and efficiently debated and considered in the time at its disposal.

Because of this desire to push the congressional machine beyond its limit of production, to run it at a higher rate of speed than it was capable of going and do good work, the parliamentary machinery has become clogged. It is perhaps an unprecedented situation. Taking all the circumstances of it together, I presume there has been no occasion in the history of the Senate when a greater strain has been put upon its machinery.

That the situation may be understood, that the reasons and the causes which have produced it may at least be known, and such weight as those causes are entitled to as a justification or otherwise may be given them, I want to review the steps that have led up to our present situation.

It can not be denied that the shipping bill is an important measure. It is important on account of the large sum of money—\$40,000,000—which is directly involved at the start of the project with which it is concerned, and of the still larger sum which in all human probability will be involved if the project is ever put into operation. How much larger that sum may be nobody has undertaken to estimate, so far as I know, but that additional sums will be required, and large sums, I have also not heard denied, and I presume nobody will undertake to deny it.

The bill is also important because it starts the Government on a new field of activity and because that field involves the principle of Government ownership instead of Government regulation of industrial affairs, a principle that, under the growing pressure of modern industrial development, is daily becoming more insistent and whose revolutionary possibilities, as regards social and business relations, are so great that to take any action upon it without due and careful consideration, without a full understanding of the nature of that step and the future possibilities of what it is committing us to, would be an unforgivable negligence of duty on the part of every legislator involved in the transaction. A measure of this character, so far-reaching in its possibilities, is entitled to be presented to this body with at least as complete a statement of the exact nature of the proposed project, with at least as voluminous testimony of men's judgment in regard to its operation, and to be debated by both its advocates and its antagonists at least as fully as is customary with other measures of similar importance in this body.

One of the causes of the extraordinary condition in which we now find ourselves is that these conditions have not been fulfilled. The course of this bill has been hurried from its beginning up to the present moment, or, at least, it has been

attempted to be hurried, but like many other things that are undertaken without careful preparation, without thorough understanding, the lack of time given to preparation has resulted in delay and waste of time instead of progress.

It is customary when an important measure is to be considered by Congress to gather together in convenient form special information in regard to it. Such information is necessary for the intelligent consideration of new projects. Members of Congress have not all the information in the world at their finger ends. They are not experts in every direction and on every subject. But what they do have to guide them in becoming at least well informed, if not expert, is the machinery for getting together the information necessary for their guidance. The usual way of obtaining and making available in concentrated form such necessary information is through the instrumentality of hearings. At such hearings men who are experts, who have the information, are brought to testify. They are subjected to examination, and their statements are questioned, so that doubtful points can be cleared up, obscure or incomplete testimony can be made plain, and by the use of the information derived from such hearings it is possible for Congress to form opinions with at least some plausible ground for supposing them to be correct. On this bill this important and usual course was practically omitted. No hearings at all were held upon this bill by any committee of this body. The only hearing that has been held was by the House committee that had a shipping bill under consideration, and that hearing was of the very briefest description. No expert in this complicated and diversified and far-reaching business of shipping appeared at all. The entire testimony that was given occupied not more than four or five hours and covers but 48 printed pages. To show how different this is from the ordinary proceedings let me compare it with the hearings that were held upon some of the other subjects that have been legislated upon during this Congress.

The Panama tolls bill was taken up for consideration. On that bill the hearings that were held occupied 1,022 pages of testimony. An important bill revising the banking and currency law of the country was being considered. Testimony was taken upon that subject by the Senate committee in 1913 occupying 3,200 pages. The Federal Trade Commission bill was considered and passed by this body. Hearings were held upon that subject in 1914 occupying 1,538 pages, and this was in addition to the fact that under a special provision of the Senate the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce had two years before, in 1912, on what was substantially the same subject, spent a large part of a winter in taking testimony which in its completed form occupied 2,500 pages. On the tariff bill, which was taken up for consideration in 1913, there were 6,345 pages of hearings. And yet, in spite of what has been the usual custom, as indicated by this list, on this equally important shipping bill the entire testimony that was taken occupied but 48 pages.

If the domain of this measure had simply involved the broad question of Government ownership, such lack of information would be unusual and, I think, inexcusable. Nevertheless it might be of less importance, because Government ownership as a principle has been much thought of and much discussed of late years and has necessarily been a matter for reflection on the part of every man in public life. There is much literature on the subject. But dealing with an emergency, as this measure is supposed to do, manifestly there was an unusual necessity that the nature and the extent of that emergency should be clearly stated and defined and that information as to the effect of this proposed remedy should be gathered from whatever reliable sources were available. Instead of that we have this bill presented with none of that information except such as might drift into the way of Senators through casual news items or stray editorials in the daily press. Manifestly none of the ordinary sources of information could supply the facts of an emergency of a character unprecedented in history, and the result was, and is, that it has been left to the diligence of individual Senators to gather together such information as they could without official assistance from any source.

Now, what was attempted to be done in the Senate with this bill? The business of the Senate during this session has been taken up so far with the consideration and passage of three measures in addition to this shipping bill. Congress met on the 7th of December, and on the 9th of December the immigration bill was made the unfinished business of the Senate and continued to be debated and to occupy the time and consideration of the Senate until it was passed on the 2d day of January. Two days before that, on December 31, the urgent deficiency bill, appropriating \$4,398,000, had been reported to the Senate, and immediately after the completion of the immi-



gration bill it was taken up and was passed on January 6. Two days before that, on Monday, January 4, this shipping bill was reported to the Senate and made the unfinished business, but was laid aside to complete the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill. On the 7th day of January, the day following the passage of the urgent deficiency bill, this shipping bill was again laid aside for the consideration of the District of Columbia bill, appropriating some \$12,000,000, one-half of which, \$6,000,000, was to be paid by the National Government. The consideration of that bill and of the national prohibition constitutional amendment, which was injected into it, lasted until January 18. So that for practically the first six weeks of the session the Senate was engaged in considering the subjects of immigration and of prohibition and in passing two appropriation bills, the total amount of money involved in which was a trifle over \$10,000,000. About one-half of that time was devoted to the consideration of the appropriation of this comparatively small sum of money out of a total of over a billion dollars that the Government will have to appropriate at this session if it completes the work ordinarily performed at this time.

If that three weeks was properly needed for the discussion and consideration of these two small appropriation bills, it would naturally seem that the balance of the session would have been none too short a time to devote to the consideration of bills appropriating the enormous additional sums that are needed to run the Government, without interjecting into the discussion and into that consideration any other great and important subject upon which the Senate was sure to differ and whose importance was sufficient to justify a careful consideration and a general debate. That, however, was not the course that was decided upon by the majority party. But on January 18, after the passage of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, this shipping bill was again made the unfinished business. The previous history of the bill in the Senate had been this:

On December 9 it was introduced by Senator STONE.

On December 16 it was reported with amendments.

On December 31 a majority report was filed.

On January 4 a minority report was filed.

On January 4 it was made the unfinished business of the Senate.

On January 6 the Committee on Commerce reported a substitute for the original bill.

On January 7 the consideration of the bill was laid aside for the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

On Monday, January 18, the shipping bill was finally taken up as the main business of the Senate.

During the following week, from January 18 until Friday at 20 minutes past 4, the bill was kept continuously before the Senate. The Senate met each morning at the unusual hour of 11 o'clock, and the sessions lasted as follows: Monday, until 6.17; Tuesday, until 6.16; Wednesday, until 6.25; Thursday, until 6; Friday, until 20 minutes past 4.

In all, the Senate was in session for 29 hours and 30 minutes, and during those 29½ hours not one single speech was made by any Member of this body in favor of this measure. What did occur, if the current reports around this body are true, and I have no doubt they are, was that every evening during that week the Democratic Senators, or a large proportion of them, were engaged in a secret caucus of whose proceedings the Senators on this side of the body had no knowledge; were holding meetings for the purpose of preparing a bill they could finally support; and the cause of the adjournment of Congress on Friday of that week and its not sitting on Saturday was for the purpose of enabling that caucus to have further secret consideration of this bill during that day and to try to arrive at some definite agreement upon the form of a bill that would be accepted as a party measure.

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that this bill was being secretly considered in this way for the purpose of perfecting it, there was constantly laid upon the Republican Members of this body the task of occupying the whole of that 29½ hours with continuous discussion of the bill, under the threat that if their discussion ceased even for a minute the bill, even in its imperfect form, would be promptly passed by the majority.

On Monday, January 25, as a result of the previous week's secret caucus action, a new substitute for the bill, the second that had been presented, was reported by the Committee on Commerce as the form in which the majority then proposed to enact this measure into law, and although there had been up to that time, with the exception of a single short speech by the Senator in charge of this bill, the Senator from Florida, no presentation of it from the Democratic side, the attempt to rush the bill through the Senate without debate was further continued. During the following week, beginning on Monday, Jan-

uary 25, the Senate met at 11 and adjourned at 6; on Tuesday, January 26, the Senate met at 11 and recessed at 5.52; on Wednesday, January 27, the Senate met at 11 and recessed at 9; on Thursday, January 28, the Senate met at 11 and recessed at 10.15; and on Friday, January 29, having met at 11 o'clock, an attempt was made to keep the Senate in continuous session until it should have passed this bill, and as a result of that unusual proceeding the Senate did remain in session all Friday night and until 11.15 Saturday night, a total of 67 hours for that week, or for those two weeks that the bill had been before the Senate a total of 96½ hours. And during that 96½ hours only one single speech was made in favor of this bill by any of the Democratic advocates of it, that speech being one occupying some two hours, made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] on one of the legal aspects of the bill, the question of the international relations that might be involved in the purchase of ships from belligerent nations.

In other words, what this record shows is that for the two weeks of this short session prior to midnight on Saturday, January 30, an attempt had been made to force through this Senate a bill that had been presented to it by the party responsible for its creation without providing any adequate information for its consideration, the construction of which had been three times radically changed as the result of secret consideration of its provisions—and I might add that it has been changed since that time—and practically without making any adequate attempt to debate or explain or defend on the floor of the Senate either its original provisions or its subsequent changes, a proceeding which I believe was absolutely indefensible, which is unworthy of any responsible legislative body, which I think is unparalleled in the history of the Senate, and which if it should become customary would inevitably destroy the usefulness of this body.

This attempt to speed up the legislative machinery far beyond its capacity of efficient performance, as is well known, was accompanied by constant declarations of the purpose on the part of the majority that in using these extraordinary methods they intended to enact this legislation into law, not by an attempt to convince its opponents of the propriety and justness of its provisions, but by the power of the physical weight of a majority sitting by in a conspiracy of silence, waiting for the physical exhaustion of their opponents.

If this proposed bill had been a thoroughly digested measure at the beginning, presented as a result of a thorough consideration of the ends it was designed to accomplish, complete in all its parts to accomplish its purpose, and meeting carefully formed views of its advocates, though the proceedings would have been revolutionary as compared with the ordinary practice of this body, perhaps the men who adopted them might have found in these facts an excuse for their course; but the changes that this bill has gone through since it was taken up for consideration by this body on January 18 until to-day is ample evidence that no such thing was the case. For scarcely had the bill been brought before the Senate on January 4 than it was almost immediately—on January 6—followed by a substitute bill from the committee having it in charge. On January 25, as the result of a week of Democratic caucus, although there had been no public debate upon it at all from the Democratic side, a second substitute was introduced, and to-day, as the result of still further private consideration, some of the provisions of that second substitute have been withdrawn and a new substitute, known as the Gore amendment, containing provisions not in either of the previous forms of the bill, has been presented to the Senate as the last form in which this silent Democratic team propose to enact their captain's bill.

Now, certainly nothing can be more unwise in a country governed as is ours than hasty and ill-considered action on important subjects by its legislative bodies. I think I am well within the bounds when I say that far too much of that inevitably takes place. There is a strong and growing conviction that a large part of our present commercial troubles are the result of such proceedings. We do not hear many complaints these days of too few laws being passed. We do hear many complaints, and from the most responsible sources of too many laws being passed. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] in a recent address pointed out that in the five years from 1909 to 1913, Congress had passed 2,013 statutes and other lawmaking bodies in this country had passed 60,000 statutes. So that the excuse for speeding up the legislative machinery on this bill can not be defended on the ground that we are suffering from a lack of lawmaking.

By long-established custom this body has become the sole tribunal in which national legislation can be given the ripe and mature consideration necessary to avoid costly mistakes. As every Member of it knows, we do enact in the course of a ses-



sion many bills, some of them of very considerable importance, without long consideration or lengthy debate. But they almost invariably deal with subjects upon which the convictions of Senators are thoroughly established and where those convictions are in substantial accord. But when this is not the case and the importance of proposed projects justifies consideration, reasonable time for debate must be allowed as well for the protection of the responsible majority against insidious errors as for the welfare of the country, and the adoption of this course has repeatedly vindicated itself.

What, then, is a reasonable time for the consideration of such a fundamental and far-reaching measure as the one under consideration? Take the Panama Canal tolls amendment of last year as an example. It was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals on April 1. It was under consideration by that committee for a month, until the 30th day of April, during which time hearings were held covering 1,022 pages. It was reported to the Senate on that day, and two days later, on the 2d of May, was made the unfinished business by the Senate, and so continued until it was passed on the 11th of June. For 40 days that bill was before this body, and the debate that occurred upon it was of such a high order and so illuminating as to various phases of the subject that I doubt if many thoughtful people would be willing to say that it was unnecessarily extended. Nevertheless the total amount involved in that bill was only some \$2,000,000 annually, as against the \$40,000,000 initial expenditure of this shipping bill, and the fundamental principle involved in it was certainly not more far-reaching than the fundamental principle in this measure.

The Federal Trade Commission bill of last year was originally introduced on January 24, a substitute was reported on June 6, and on June 25 it was made the unfinished business. Forty-one days later, on August 5, it passed this body. I can not conceive that anyone would believe that that bill to establish machinery among other things, for regulating monopoly was any more important or fundamental than this bill, which proposes to establish a monopoly, and that, too, the most pernicious form of monopoly, because, while an ordinary business monopoly can be regulated or controlled by the Government, from the exactions of a Government monopoly there is usually no practicable appeal.

If, then, in the case of these two recent bills, a consideration of nearly seven weeks each was justified, there can be no justification for attempting to force this bill through the Senate in the way the majority have undertaken to do. If this amount of time, as the RECORD shows, was taken for consideration of these bills, the question naturally arises, Why is the attempt being made to curtail the consideration of this shipping bill? The reason is very plain, for the fact is that in the limited time of this session it would be utterly impossible to give this shipping bill the usual consideration that is given bills of such importance, and also to give to the appropriation bills the reasonable and proper consideration that they are entitled to.

If, therefore, an extra session of Congress was to be avoided and all of this legislation was to be accomplished, it was absolutely necessary that one portion or another of it should not have proper consideration, and the trouble that has arisen in connection with this matter is entirely due, I think, to this attempt to force upon Congress more legislation than it could legitimately undertake in the time at its disposal. If this shipping bill had been presented in the customary way, if there had been no attempt to prevent a reasonable and full discussion of its provisions, with reasonable time allowed for the consideration and digestion of the circumstances that discussion might develop, which is the only way any bill can be properly considered by this body or any other, I do not believe that anything like the present situation would have arisen here. Other measures have been presented here by this Democratic majority, to the principles and details of which the Republicans were opposed, without there being any suggestion of any extraordinary measures of opposition, and if this bill had been allowed by its advocates to take the ordinary course I do not believe it would have excited any extraordinary opposition. But that has not been the case. It has not been presented here in the ordinary way in which such measures are presented.

From the very beginning of its active consideration an attempt was made to establish a practical cloture—to limit discussion, to avoid debate. The Senate was kept in session unusual hours, and every minute of the time the opponents of the bill had to exercise constant watchfulness lest in an unwary moment they were caught off their guard and a vote be taken. Speakers had to be ready to follow each other in unbroken succession, unusual parliamentary devices had to be resorted to. Was this because the debate had been unusually extended?

Can anybody pretend that a shipping bill ought to have been passed during that first week of its consideration, when the form of bill for which its advocates would finally stand had not even been agreed upon, much less presented for consideration? Yet it was under the well-understood threat of such a step that the Republicans carried on their discussion of the general subject during that entire week. I say of the general subject, for no one knew what the exact bill was to be, not even the Democrats themselves. That remained for the secret deliberations of the caucus to decide, influenced by considerations that were not made public, and yet it was the business of the public that was being discussed.

And then the second week began. And on that second Monday what then was supposed to be the final form of the bill was laid before the Senate—the first notice that the Senate, as a whole, had of its details. Was it then proposed that time should be permitted for a full and free and fair consideration and discussion? Not at all. The same threat, but intensified, was in the air. There was no doubt about it here on the floor or in the cloakroom. It was reflected in the press and on the street. And to carry out the undenied purpose of the majority the Senate was kept in session on Wednesday till 9 o'clock, on Thursday till 10.15, all night on Friday, and, without interruption, until 11.15 Saturday evening. And how were these long hours spent? Were they for the purpose of enabling the advocates of this new measure to explain and defend the policies and the purposes and the changes of this bill? Not at all. Practically all of the time had to be used up in some way by the bill's opponents, or this unexplained, undefended bill was to pass. The majority believed they could pass it before that Saturday evening came to a close, and they meant to do it. The gallery yonder was filled with their wives and daughters come to see the triumph of their cause. And it was not the cogency of their arguments they were relying upon to accomplish this result, for they had made none, but upon the physical exhaustion of their opponents.

But this un-American form of argument did not succeed. It ought not to succeed. Men came from their sick beds to risk their lives to oppose it. Men of advanced age, in their seventies, willingly faced the strain upon their health and strength to keep the vigil of those long night hours to see that it did not succeed. And younger men skilled in debate, equipped for such a struggle through long years spent in the study of public questions, took up the burden of discussion. And then what happened? Why, the un-American policy of silence and secrecy and physical exhaustion failed, but the thoroughly American policy of frank and full publicity and discussion did not fail. It succeeded, for scarcely had the next week opened when seven of the ablest among the Democrats declared their intention to oppose this measure. The habit of free and full debate that for more than a century has been the custom of this body vindicated itself. It has been said that oratory never changed a vote. I do not know whether those long two weeks of continuous speeches changed these votes, but if they had not been made the opportunity for the convictions of these courageous and conscientious Senators to become crystallized would not have existed.

What are the purposes of these debates here in the Senate? What is the justification of them? There are two principal ones. The effect they will have on the opinions and the votes of the Senators themselves. We have seen that this debate was not without results in that direction. And then the effect they will have on the opinions and votes of the people outside of this Chamber, and to give time and opportunity for those outside opinions to be reflected back here again. This can not happen in a day or a week. The American people, thank God, are usually busy with their own concerns, but they expect us to conduct ours with the same patience and wisdom and thoroughness that they give to their own. But when they find us in doubt and the opportunity is given them, the weight of their opinions usually finds a way to manifest itself. It comes through the press, whose general policy is to mirror that opinion. It comes through the declarations of public and semipublic organizations. It comes through private correspondence. It seems as though the weight of that opinion to-day is against this measure. But perhaps it has not yet had the time to be definitely formed, or at least to convincingly express itself. Senators may doubt the final form it will take.

But of the situation here there is no doubt. It is a tie. Practically the Senate is equally divided, at least so far as votes are concerned. So far as the personal convictions of Senators are concerned it is not a tie. It is against the bill. And if it is a tie as regards the actual votes in the population those votes represent it is not a tie. I have here a table showing the population of those States whose Senators are united in favor of this bill, of those States whose Senators are against the bill, of those



States whose Senators are divided on the question. I will not read it, but without objection I will ask permission to have it printed as part of my remarks. I presume the Senators have a fairly good idea of the opinion of the people of the States they represent on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

FOR.	
Arizona	204,354
Colorado	799,024
Florida	752,619
Indiana	2,700,876
Louisiana	1,656,388
Maryland	1,295,346
Missouri	3,293,335
Montana	376,053
Nevada	81,875
New Jersey	2,537,167
North Carolina	2,206,287
Oklahoma	1,657,155
Oregon	672,765
South Carolina	1,515,400
Tennessee	2,184,789
Texas	3,896,542
Virginia	2,061,612
17 States	27,891,487
AGAINST.	
California	2,377,549
Connecticut	1,114,756
Idaho	325,594
Iowa	2,224,771
Massachusetts	3,366,416
Michigan	2,810,173
Minnesota	2,075,708
Nebraska	1,192,214
New Mexico	327,301
New York	9,113,614
North Dakota	577,056
Pennsylvania	7,065,111
Rhode Island	542,610
South Dakota	583,888
Utah	373,351
Vermont	355,956
Washington	1,141,990
Wyoming	145,965
18 States	36,314,023
DIVIDED.	
Alabama	2,138,093
Arkansas	1,574,449
Delaware	202,322
Georgia	2,609,121
Illinois	5,638,591
Kansas	1,690,949
Kentucky	2,289,905
Maine	742,371
Mississippi	1,797,114
New Hampshire	430,572
Ohio	4,767,121
West Virginia	1,221,219
Wisconsin	2,333,860
13 States	27,435,687

Mr. LIPPITT. What that table shows is that the 18 States where the Senators are a unit against the bill have a population of 36,314,023 people; that the 17 States whose Senators are a unit in favor of the passage of this bill represent 27,891,487 people. If this is any guide to the sentiment of the people, it shows that there are 33 per cent more against the bill than there are in favor of it.

What, then, ought to be done with this bill if its consideration is to be continued? I think it ought to be dropped, anyway for the time being, and the appropriation bills taken up. But if it is to be continued, what then is the right policy to be adopted under the conditions as they exist? Manifestly, to continue the discussion in a fair and patient and temperate and customary manner. To let both sides present their arguments on this actual measure, have amendments made and considered on their merits here on the floor of the Senate, and decided here, not in a caucus, whether secret or open, so that whatever is done will be the record of the majority of the Senate and not of two-thirds of a secret society. Probably we would then arrive at a decision sooner or later—and there is no hurry about it—that will represent the best opinion and the final wish of America. Perhaps we would find a compromise that even if it did not suit the extremist on either side, might be satisfactory to moderate-minded people. And then, when the discussion had run its course, whether in this session or an extra one, do as this body has done on hundreds of other questions, great and small, in the past, take a vote and settle this question in accordance with the mature convictions of the Senate, convictions formed here as the result of consideration and not under coercion from any source. Then the Senate and its ways will be justified to itself and the country.

But what is it that it is proposed to do? Violate and ignore the rules established for the orderly conduct of the meetings of

this body on the one hand, destroy them by the ruthless hands of arbitrary power if that power can be assembled and bound for the purpose, override them against such protest as the minority can make, put the vote and declare it carried if a majority of even a single vote can be found to cast it. Or establish a cloture rule to cut off debate on the pretense that debate has been too extended. Why, there has not been a single hour of free and untrammelled debate on this bill yet. And even if the time that has elapsed since the bill in its completed form was laid before the Senate on January 25 by some freak of the imagination is to be assumed to have been spent in proper debate, then it is but three weeks that have been so spent, when six and seven weeks have been spent in the consideration of no more important bills without a suggestion from either side of the Chamber or from the country that such time was wasted. On the contrary, it has been repeatedly recognized by many students of congressional procedure that these debates had materially improved the measures they were directed to. Such an editorial was in last night's Washington Star, and no doubt hundreds of them could be collected from important papers all over the country. What then would be the purpose and result of such a rule passed in opposition to the century-old experience of the Senate? Why, simply to make easier in the future the task of an impatient majority that was willing to substitute the policy of physical exhaustion of the minority, as has been attempted on this occasion, for the method of meeting it in fair discussion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator from Rhode Island has, as have several other Senators in this discussion, referred to the Democratic claim that the majority have been prevented from voting on this measure. Is it not a fact that practically on every test vote which has come near the heart of this question there has been shown an exact division of the two sides of the Chamber, and that it has required the vote of the Vice President to decide many of the questions? So, instead of speaking of the majority, is it not better to say that, when the Senate is equally divided on this question, one-half of the Senate is asked to surrender to the other half and to allow the Vice President to cast the deciding vote? Half of the Senators are opposed to this bill, as practically every record vote has disclosed. I have no doubt the Senator from Rhode Island has observed this fact.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the question which the Senator from Michigan asks is certainly very pertinent. In the previous part of my address I had referred to the situation of the Senate being that of a tie, and suggested that the only proper method to pursue in regard to this bill was to continue the debate until we could arrive at some conclusion. I think what the Senator says about the Senate's being in a tie and neither side having a majority is absolutely correct.

We know the explanation of all this. We know that this is a measure that the President of the United States, as a team captain, had decided upon. We know that it was being pushed without the approval of a very considerable number of the Democrats of this body. We know that even of those who now support it that it is not deep conviction that animates them, but the assumed necessity of party loyalty. We have a record in the presumptions, and I think I am justified in saying the impertinent, threat which the President of the United States indulged in in his speech at Indianapolis toward the Republican Members of this body which shows the arbitrary temper with which the administration were dealing with this subject at that time. If the President was in such a state of mind then that he could characterize the Republicans of this body, from whom he would naturally expect criticism, as misguided or blind or ignorant, and challenge them to show their right to oppose his measure, what he would think or do or say to opposition in his own party I think may well be left to the imagination.

These, then, are the extraordinary conditions that have surrounded the attempt to pass this bill. Their adoption led to the use of extraordinary methods to meet them. Those methods have been called a filibuster. Perhaps that name is as useful as any. Justification for the things itself exists in the indefensible character of the methods to which it has been opposed. If the Republicans have apparently accepted the challenge to talk this bill to death, it is because the Democrats have failed to perform their duty of talking it into life. The bill has been brought in here like a vagrant walf from the city slums, nameless, half fed, half clothed, and defenseless, its merits, if it has any, unrecognizable from neglect and abuse. The situation here is certainly extraordinary. I am told by those who have



been long in this body that nothing like it has occurred for 20 years, since the early nineties, when the protest in regard to silver legislation took this form, and when on another occasion, at about that same period, the able representatives from the South of the State rights doctrine—a doctrine which the representatives from the same communities to-day have apparently forgotten—used this same weapon of filibustering to protect a theory which they believed was vital to their existence.

In another way this occasion is extraordinary. It is extraordinary because the resentment on this side of the Chamber against the methods that have been adopted for the passage of this bill is so strong and because the conviction on this side of the Chamber in regard to the unwisdom of the measure itself is so great that for the first time in four years there exists here a practically united opposition to the policies of those who sit on the other side of the aisle. With but a single exception, the Senators on this side of the Chamber, whether conservative or progressive, are a unit in opposing this product of a combination between the secret caucus and the presidential prerogative. And not only has this extraordinary procedure in connection with this bill caused these extraordinary remedies to be adopted, but another extraordinary remedy of even deeper significance has been forced into action, for seven of the ablest Democratic Members of this body have felt obliged to temporarily break their allegiance to party policy and throw the great weight of their influence against this bill and the methods being used in its favor. I say seven of the ablest Democrats, for I venture to say that it would be impossible to get together from the Democratic side of this Chamber another seven men who would stand higher than those seven in the judgment of their associates. I do not mean to say that there are not other Democratic Senators who are not highly esteemed by all the Members of this body. I do not mean to say that there are not other individual Democratic Senators who are not as highly esteemed as any of these seven; but I do say that there is no group of Senators on that side whose character and ability is held in any higher estimation. They not only stand high individually, but what they represent is suggestive. It is not a revolt caused by any sectional feeling. The East and the West and the South have in that seven some of their ablest representatives. The importance of the communities that they represent, in numbers and in high character, is suggestive. The life-long affiliations of these Senators with Democracy is suggestive. Men of this type do not lightly break their party ties. They do not hastily or without the incentive of deep convictions put themselves in opposition to a party policy. They all of them understand the strength that comes from union. They, as much as anyone, realize the necessity of some subordination of personal belief to the convictions of a majority. That the extraordinary circumstances, then, attending this measure have brought into existence this most extraordinary remedy is in itself the severest condemnation that can be conceived of those methods themselves.

Within the last two or three days there have been several propositions introduced by the more radical supporters of this bill looking to help its passage by the establishment of some kind of a cloture, and the authors of them in some cases have urged in favor of them, and not without heat, the necessity of the majority of the Senate being able to register its will. Let me say again to the gentlemen who think such changes are necessary that the result of the Republican discussion of this bill, which you can call a filibuster if you wish, has absolutely vindicated itself in the situation which exists here to-day. This discussion and consideration, one sided as it has been, has already forced change after change to be made and remade from the original bill that was laid before this body. It has produced the extraordinary revolt that has occurred in the Democratic ranks and it has established the fact in the consciousness of every Member here that if this bill could be voted upon in such a way that each Senator should record his individual convictions, free from the coercion of party machinery, there would be an ample majority against it.

I believe the procedure that has been adopted in favor of this bill is absolutely indefensible, and whatever action I have been impelled to take in opposition to it I have taken not alone because my convictions are against the wisdom of the measure, but as a protest against these revolutionary practices which, if persisted in, I believe will inevitably destroy the usefulness of the Senate. The Senate can not be useful unless it is independent. There has been a growing tendency toward domination by the Executive over this body. It did not originate with the present administration. But, in spite of the very positive pre-election declarations of Mr. Wilson in regard to publicity and openness in the conduct of governmental business, he has not merely adopted the policy of Executive domination that some

of his predecessors had attempted but he has gone far beyond it, and in this particular instance the attempt has been made not merely to compel the adoption of his particular views on this subject, but also to compel their adoption without the usual opportunity for the discussion and consideration of those measures.

The break in the Democratic ranks has enabled us to know something of the inside caucus history of this bill. We know now by the declarations on this floor of men who participated in these secret meetings something of what occurred there. That there was opposition there was easily inferred from the fact that it took a whole long week of repeated conferences to arrive at a decision. But we know now that, while the rules under which that secret organization compelled its decisions to be registered on this floor by the votes of its members was through the drastic use of a two-thirds vote, binding the entire membership, in this case so strong was the opposition that out of the 53 Senators comprising its membership, when the vote was taken upon the approval of the bill, there were only 35 Democrats who voted in favor of it, that being 1 less than the two-thirds necessary to bind the entire membership, and therefore it was necessary, in order to get the majority necessary for the despotic dictates of the caucus to operate, to persuade one of the Senators opposed to the measure to change his vote. This was done, by what inducements has not yet been revealed, and so the final vote which set all this machinery going was the bare 36 votes, without which it could not be put in force at all.

We know now that, as this situation stands, the attempt is being made to put this bill through this body because 25 Democratic Senators out of a total of the 96 Members in this body perhaps believed in it. That may be modern Democratic doctrine, but it is not the rule of the majority as it is understood by the American people, and it is not a method of transacting business that will enable the Senate of the United States to retain the confidence of the people.

I believe there is but one proper proceeding that should now be taken by this body, and that is to proceed to the consideration of the proper business of this session, the consideration and passage of as many as possible of the appropriation bills. Even if we undertake that at once and use all the time there is at the disposal of Congress before the 4th of March, we shall, even then, be obliged to give too little rather than too much time to the consideration of the very important subject of national finance. But the consideration of that subject is the legitimate and proper business of this session, and it ought not to be neglected.

If when that is done the President of the United States thinks the enactment of legislation on this shipping question is of such importance that it justifies the calling of Congress together in extra session, I for one have no objection at all to that session being called. And if, after a reasonable and proper time has been given to the discussion of a shipping bill under those circumstances, free from the extraordinary attempt that has been made at the present session to throttle debate, and free from any attempt to introduce a practical cloture by trying to physically exhaust the opponents of the measure—if then a majority of this body, influenced by their convictions instead of a caucus gag, decide that they want to pass this shipping bill or something like it, I believe there will be no unusual objection made to it by the Republican Members of this body. But under the conditions that I have attempted to describe, and by the methods that have been adopted, this bill ought not to pass; and if, through any parliamentary manipulation, it is forced through at this session as a result of this two-thirds caucus gag rule, itself instigated by what I consider an improper use of the presidential prerogative, the Senate will have taken a long step toward destroying its prestige and its usefulness.

Among the departments of the Government, this Senate is the citadel of free speech. It is the only forum where the great principles of government and the rights and liberties of the people can be freely and exhaustively debated and discussed. It is not a new thing to have that prerogative of this body challenged by ambitious and obstinate Executives, carried away by enthusiasm for their own ideas and impatient at opposition to their plans.

The character of the present Executive as it has day by day unfolded itself seems to point to as determined an effort in that direction as has ever been made. We begin to see the basis for the generally accepted belief that the trustees of Princeton University, fearful of the effects of the domineering disposition of Mr. Wilson upon the future of that institution, were not displeased when he left them for other activities. We begin to see why the rugged honesty and sturdy independence



of Grover Cleveland forced him to break away from his connection with that university.

The significance of President Wilson's laudation of President Jackson at Indianapolis is given a deeper meaning by the events that have rapidly followed each other since that speech was made. The most determined attack that was ever made upon those rights and prerogatives that are essential to this body if it is properly to perform its duties and continue to occupy an important place in the function of government occurred under Jackson's administration. I do not know of any better way to set forth the larger meaning and the possibilities of the present situation than to quote the language in which Daniel Webster discussed this same question of the Senate's duties and powers at that time. In the Senate, on May 7, 1834, Senator Webster used the language which, without objection, Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are intrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the Government is overthrown, or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general freedom. Those fathers accomplished the Revolution on a strict question of principle. The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the Colonies in all cases whatsoever, and it was precisely on this question that they made the Revolution turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was, in their eyes, enough. It was against the recital of an act of Parliament rather than against any suffering under its enactments that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal principle of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguises, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady eye or their well-directed blow till they had extirpated and destroyed it, to the smallest fiber. On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against a power to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subjugation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a power which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drumbeat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England.

The necessity of holding strictly to the principle upon which free governments are constructed, and to those precise lines which fix the partitions of power between different branches, is as plain if not as cogent as that of resisting, as our fathers did, the strides of the parent country against the rights of the Colonies, because, whether the power which exceeds its just limits be foreign or domestic, whether it be the encroachment of all branches on the rights of the people, or that of one branch on the rights of others, in either case the balanced and well-adjusted machinery of free government is disturbed, and, if the derangement go on, the whole system must fail.

Mr. President, the contest for ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of executive power. Whoever has engaged in her sacred cause, from the days of the downfall of those great aristocracies which had stood between the King and the people to the time of our own independence has struggled for the accomplishment of that single object. On the long list of the champions of human freedom there is not one name dimmed by the reproach of advocating the extension of executive authority; on the contrary, the uniform and steady purpose of all such champions has been to limit and restrain it.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, at other times in the history of the Government more or less vigorous attempts have been made to sweep away senatorial opposition to presidential plans. They have not succeeded because heretofore they have always been vigorously and successfully resisted. As this present attempt is being made by Democrats, perhaps it will not be amiss to quote the language in which one of the great Democrats of the last century expressed his opinion upon this subject. In the speech which Stephen A. Douglas made at Alton, Ill., on the 15th of October, 1858, he spoke as follows:

I hold that an attempt to control the Senate on the part of the Executive is subversive of the principles of our Constitution. The Executive department is independent of the Senate, and the Senate is independent of the President. In matters of legislation the President has a veto on the action of the Senate, and in appointments and treaties the Senate has a veto on the President. He has no more right to tell me how I shall vote on his appointments than I have to tell him whether he shall veto or approve a bill that the Senate has passed. Whenever you recognize the right of the Executive to say to a Senator, "Do this or I will take off the heads of your friends," you convert this Government from a Republic into a despotism. Whenever you recognize the right of a President to say to a Member of Congress, "Vote as I tell you or I will bring a power to bear against you at home which will crush you," you destroy the independence of the Representative and convert him into a tool of Executive power. I resisted this invasion of the constitutional rights of a Senator and I intend to resist it as long as I have a voice to speak or a vote to give.

The particular method which is now relied upon to destroy the independence and the importance which has adhered to this Senate from the beginning, and which Webster so eloquently defended, is the two-thirds rule of the Democratic caucus.

Probably no more efficient instrument could be devised for that purpose, if it can be established and maintained in practice. If the entire vote of a party can be absolutely bound by such a device, if all the independent and courageous men on the other side of the Chamber can be brought into subjection in this way, it makes the task of an ambitious and forceful Executive comparatively easy.

Such a rule, while obnoxious under any circumstances in such a body as this, is perhaps not of so great importance while a party is in a minority, but as an instrument of legislation in a majority party, its effect upon the importance of the Senate in legislation must be swift and deadly. This rule was adopted, as it has recently developed, in 1903, and one of the very earliest attempts at its enforcement occasioned a determined revolt from its tyranny on the part of one of the Democratic Senators of that day, against whose right of independent action it was invoked. I want to read the language in which Mr. Patterson, then Senator from Colorado, expressed his disapproval of it.

Without objection, Mr. President, I will not read this, but I will ask that it be inserted as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. Patterson on the 5th instant, as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that 'the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislatures thereof,' and that 'each Senator shall have one vote'; and

"Whereas each Senator, before assuming the duties of his office, is required to solemnly swear or affirm that he 'will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that he will faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which he is about to enter'; and

"Whereas, because it was currently reported that one or more Democratic Senators might vote upon certain matters pending before the Senate contrary to the view of a majority of the body of Democratic Senators, the Democratic Senators were called to caucus upon such matters; and

"Whereas it was found at such caucus that said reports were correct, and that certain Democratic Senators might or would vote contrary to the views of said majority; and

"Whereas thereupon the following resolutions were presented and adopted by more than two-thirds of the Senators present at said caucus:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate ought not to advise and consent to the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Santo Domingo, now pending before the Senate.

"*Resolved*, That if two-thirds of this caucus shall vote in favor of the foregoing resolution it shall be the duty of every Democratic Senator to vote against the ratification of the said treaty"; and

"Whereas the apparent purpose of said resolutions and action was to improperly induce or coerce Democratic Senators who might believe that the best interests of the country required the ratification of said treaty, and because thereof held it to be their duty to vote for its ratification, into disregarding that part of their oaths in which they declared that they would faithfully discharge the duties of the office of Senator: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, First. That such action by the said or any other caucus is in plain violation of the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States.

"Second. That for two-thirds or any other number of the Senators of any party to meet and declare that 'it shall be the duty' of any Senator to vote upon any question other than as his own convictions impel him is a plain violation of the manifest intent and spirit of the Constitution all have sworn to uphold and defend.

"Third. That the 'one vote' the Constitution declares each Senator shall have is his own vote and not the vote of any other or of any number of other Senators, and for a Senator to cast that 'one vote' against his convictions of right and duty in the premises is to disfranchise his State in the Senate and to deprive it of the representation in that body the Constitution provides it shall have.

"Fourth. That when any number of Senators by combination or otherwise undertake, through any species of coercion, to induce other Senators to vote except as their judgments and consciences tell them, it is an invasion of the rights of a State to equal representation with other States in the Senate, and is subversive of their rights to equal representation and the votes of its Senators in the Senate that the Constitution has provided for.

"Fifth. That the Senator who permits any body of other Senators to declare and define for him what his duty is in the matter of his vote in the Senate, and who casts his vote in response to such interference, votes not as a Senator from his own State, but as a Senator from the other States, and he augments the power of the other States beyond that permitted by the Constitution and weakens and degrades the power of his own State in the Senate, in violation of the spirit of the Constitution.

"Sixth. That for any Senator to vote except as his judgment and sense of duty under his oath of office requires is to degrade the high office of Senator and to assail the dignity and standing of the Senate of the United States—qualities possessed in such high degree by no other legislative body in the world."

Mr. LIPPITT. It seems to me, Mr. President, that whatever importance might have attached at the beginning to the propriety or otherwise of enacting this shipping legislation has been dwarfed into insignificance by the selection of the instrument with which it is hoped now to drive this legislation through a Senate in which it had been impossible to hold on its merits a majority in favor of it.

We have become so much accustomed to inconsistencies in the present administration that we have perhaps become hardened to them; but when we consider the situation of an



Executive who, in his preelection addresses, had exalted publicity and frankness into such a high place as did Mr. Wilson in his address on "Let there be light," and who again recently reasserted his allegiance to that principle of publicity in no less forcible language in his address before the electrical engineers in Washington last month, on which occasion he used words which, without objection, I shall ask to have inserted in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

There are, therefore, I suppose, certain rules of the game. I will mention what seem to me some of them. I have already mentioned one of them by way of illustration. First of all is the rule of publicity: Not doing anything under cover; letting the public know what you are doing and judge of it according as it is. There are a great many businesses in this country that have fallen under suspicion because they were so secretive, when there was nothing to secrete that was dishonorable. The minute I keep everything in my pocket and will not show anybody what is there, they conjecture what may be in my pocket; whereas if I turn my pockets inside out the conjecture is, at any rate, dissipated. There is no use inviting suspicion by secretiveness. If a business is being honorably done and successfully done, you ought to be pleased to turn it inside out and let the people whom you are inviting to invest in it see exactly how it is done and with what results. Publicity, which is required in sport, is required in business. Let's see how you are running the game!

Mr. LIPPITT. Then when we find ourselves confronted by this attempt to enact legislation by the device of a secret caucus, and when we find Mr. Wilson expressing in his speech at Indianapolis his high appreciation of the importance of independence in politics and of the independent voter, and we then find this same caucus using this tyrannical two-thirds device to suppress every vestige and possibility of independence in their own ranks, we find a situation developing itself that even the most callous can not be indifferent to.

Mr. Webster forcibly stated the necessity of resisting the first encroachment of Executive domination upon the equal participation in affairs of the coordinate branches of this Government. This situation now has developed far beyond the condition of a first step. It is in the condition of a full-fledged conspiracy, rapidly moving to accomplish its purpose, and demands the immediate consideration of the American Senate and the American people.

We have seen the present Executive undertake an impertinent and entirely improper interference with the internal affairs of a neighboring nation, and when his officious meddling was received with the resentment that was inevitable, not hesitating to use all the influence and powers of his great position, even to the extent of employing the Navy against one of the chief cities of that friendly nation to bring about the demoralization and the horrors of a Villanized Mexico. Patriotism demands that our opposition be swift and decisive against the first steps, however unwittingly they may be made, toward an Executive domination of the government of this country which may ultimately result in the despotism of a Diaz and a Mexicanized America.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate a communication just received from the Secretary of the Treasury, beginning:

In compliance with the letter I addressed to you yesterday, I now have the pleasure of answering the questions propounded in the resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator BURTON on the 13th instant.

I ask to have this communication inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 16, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: In compliance with the letter I addressed to you yesterday, I now have the pleasure of answering the questions propounded in the resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator BURTON on the 13th instant.

First, Has the Secretary of the Treasury knowledge that any officer of the Government has made overtures or addressed inquiries to the owners of ships under the flags of belligerent nations, including those ships now detained in ports of the United States or other neutral ports, with a view to the purchase of such ships on the part of the Government of the United States or any of its authorized agencies?

No; unless certain inquiries made last summer by the Secretary of War as a member of the Board of Relief, composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, and Navy, appointed by the President on the 5th of August, 1914, to have general charge of the work of relief, protection, and transportation of American citizens abroad, under and by virtue of joint resolution 314, passed August 5, 1914, may be considered as coming within the purview of the question.

It will be recalled that upon the outbreak of the European war in August, 1914, it was estimated that more than 100,000 American citizens were scattered throughout Europe. Their letters of credit had become unavailable because of the breaking down of exchange transactions between the various countries at war, steamship traffic was partially paralyzed, and they were left in a precarious situation. Congress made an appropriation of \$2,750,000 for their relief, and by Executive order the President appointed the Board of Relief to which I have referred.

The question of the transportation of American citizens across the high seas was one of the most serious problems with which the Board of Relief had to contend. As the War Department had large experience in transporting troops and handling matters of transportation, this particular branch of the work was intrusted to the Secretary of War. Whatever negotiations he had with steamship companies were solely with a view to making provision for the transportation of American citizens in this emergency. Since the emergency disappeared no communications have been had by the Relief Board, or any member thereof, or any agent or employee of the Government, so far as I have knowledge, with any steamship company or companies or shipowners, except to the extent that such communications have been made necessary to effect a settlement for charter parties or for charges made by such companies for transporting American citizens from Europe to the United States.

Second, Have tenders of sale of any merchant ship or ships carrying the flag of any of the belligerent nations been made to the United States or any of its officers or agencies?

Possibly some vessels were offered to the Secretary of War in connection with the relief and transportation of American citizens, as stated in my answer to the first question.

The Merchant Marine Agency, J. V. McCarthy, manager, of Boston, Mass., in January, 1915, voluntarily and without the solicitation or request of the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the Secretary of the Treasury a list of vessels, some of English and some of German registry, as shown in Exhibit 77 to the report made to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce on the 27th of January, 1915, in response to Senate resolution of December 18, 1914, and to which reference is made. Reference is also made to Exhibits 75, 75A, 75B, and 75C of said report, showing some offerings of ships of British and French registry, made through Mr. B. N. Baker, of Baltimore. Mr. Baker gave the information contained in these exhibits in response to a question I asked him, viz, whether it was true, as alleged by opponents of the shipping bill, that no ships other than the interned German vessels could be purchased if the shipping bill became law?

Third, Have there been any tenders for the sale of vessels at present carrying the flag of any neutral nation to the United States or any responsible officer or agent thereof?

I attach as Exhibit No. 1 several letters and voluntary offerings made by the Merchant Marine Agency, of Boston, J. V. McCarthy, manager, dated February 3, 4, and 6, of various ships of neutral registry. The Secretary of the Treasury has entered into no negotiations with Mr. McCarthy or anybody else for the purchase of ships. These offers were submitted to the Treasury Department, as before stated, without solicitation on my part, and resulted, I presume, from the publication of the fact that the shipping bill is under consideration by the Congress, and that the Secretary of the Treasury is mentioned as a member of the shipping board.

Fourth, Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that any individual, firm, or corporation in the United States has made loans or advances to any individual, firm, or corporation owning ships which are detained in the ports of the United States or elsewhere to avoid the consequences of war; or that any person, firm, or corporation, acting either in private capacity or that of agent for the Government, holds an option on any such ship or ships contemplating their transfer either to the Government of the United States, an agency thereof, or to private citizens of the United States?

I have no knowledge whatever of any such transactions as those referred to in this question, nor have I heard of any such.

Fifth, Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Government of the United States, or any official thereof, has in his employ or under his direction any person or agent who is making inquiry as to the possibility of purchasing any ship or ships of any description whatsoever contemplating their eventual transfer to the United States or an agency thereof?

In each of the above instances the names of the persons, ships, and terms involved in each contemplated sale or purchase is requested.

I have no such knowledge, except as to the Treasury Department, where I can state that neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor anyone under his authority, or acting upon his direction, or as an agent, is making or has made inquiry as to the possibility of purchasing any ship or ships of any description whatsoever contemplating their eventual transfer to the United States or an agency thereof, or otherwise.

In view of false rumors and statements which have come to my ears, permit me to say in conclusion that the Secretary of the Treasury has at no time had a communication from or discussion with any banking house, banking institution, or banker, in or out of the United States, in connection with the purchase, sale, or disposition in any manner whatsoever of the German ships interned in the ports of the United States or elsewhere, or in connection with any other ships of belligerent or neutral nations for any purpose whatsoever.

Respectfully,

W. G. McADOO, Secretary.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,  
United States Senate.  
(Inclosures.)

MERCHANT MARINE AGENCY,  
Boston, Mass., February 6, 1915.

Mr. COOKSEY,  
Private Secretary to Secretary of Treasury,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed find a description of Dutch, Norwegian, and Swedish boats which I wrote and telegraphed about from New York City.

As I stated when I saw you in Washington, wherever prices are quoted to me in pounds sterling I estimated on \$5 to the pound in my list of prices. Where prices have been quoted to me as net prices by some people who have listed their boats for sale, I have added 5 per cent as a commission, which is the customary commission charged in connection with the sale of steamships by brokers in this country.

In the offering of French ships Nos. 24, 25, and 26 I was requested to ask 60,000 pounds sterling for each ship, but to offer the three ships for sale and to try a price of 150,000 pounds sterling for the three. The other ships are all listed exactly as they came to me.

In event of the shipping bill going through and becoming a law I hope to be able to still have some ships left to sell to the Government, but I am now starting a campaign to see what I can do in the way of placing some of these neutral ships in the different shipping centers of the United States.

Very truly, yours,

J. V. MCCARTHY.



[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, February 4, 1915.

SECRETARY TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.:Can offer nine more Swedish steamships. Particulars later.  
McCARTHY.

NEW YORK CITY, February 5, 1915.

SECRETARY UNITED STATES TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have cable on *Boye Marstal*, 8,000-ton dead-weight, Danish, price about \$335,000, delivery February. Kindly keep names of ships confidential, as they are my only protection; if other people get hold of names, they could possibly make a sale and I would lose out on commission.

Respectfully,

J. V. MCCARTHY.

NEW YORK CITY, February 5, 1915.

SECRETARY UNITED STATES TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I can offer you for purchase two steamships in Holland, *Prins Willem I*, 24,100 pounds sterling; *Prins Willem V*, 17,500 pounds sterling.

I will write further when I arrive in Boston.

Respectfully,

J. V. MCCARTHY.

STEAMERS FOR SALE BY MERCHANT-MARINE AGENCY, 1123 OLD SOUTH BUILDING, BOSTON, MASS., J. V. MCCARTHY, MANAGER. WE CAN NOT MAKE THE PRICES OR OFFERS OF THE STEAMERS AS FIRM OFFERS. THEY ARE SUBJECT ONLY TO BEING STILL AVAILABLE ON RECEIPT OF YOUR REPLY. WE WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ERRORS IN DESCRIPTION.

No. 23.

7,437 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.11½-foot draft loaded; built 1906 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 379.5 feet by 50 feet by 25.4 feet; molded; cubic capacity, 416,300 cubic feet; grain; 11 knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 26 inch, 42 inch, 72 inch, by 54-inch stroke; three boilers (S. E., F. D.). 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast in double cellular bottom, 888 T.-A. P. T. 45 T.; peaks and deep tank; 6 hatches. (3)-24 by 16 feet, 28 by 16 feet, 18 by 16 feet; 4 holds; 9 steam winches; steam windlass; steam steering gear; between decks, 7 feet 11½ inches by 8 feet high; bronze propeller; electric light; 2 steel decks, with shelter deck above same; coefficient, '77.

Gross registry, 3,974; net registry, 2,541; price, \$262,500. Under British registry.

No. 24.

7,890 tons of dead-weight, including bunkers (summer), on 25.10-foot draft loaded; built 1904 of steel, Veritas; dimensions, 413.5 feet by 49.7 feet by 29.7 feet, molded; 9.38 knots, 9.11 knots on 37½ T./43½ T. consumption; triple twin screw engines; 6 cylinders, 25½ inch, 33 inch, 52 inch by 35½-inch stroke; water ballast, 1,202 tons; electric light; 2 decks and awning deck; accommodations for 45 first-class passengers, 48 third-class passengers; bunks, including hospital, 496.

Gross registry, 6,472; net registry, 4,203; price, \$300,000. Under French registry.

No. 25.

7,163 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 25-foot draft loaded; built 1899 of steel, Veritas; dimensions, 408.4 feet by 49.5 feet by 27.5 feet, molded; 10.7 knots on 41 T. consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 29 inch, 47 inch, 78 inch by 51-inch stroke; F. D. boilers; water ballast, 1,087 tons; electric lights; 1 deck and spar deck; accommodations for 71 first-class passengers, 76 third-class passengers.

Gross registry, 6,075; net registry, 3,890; price, \$300,000. Under French registry.

No. 26.

8,819 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 25.4-foot draft loaded; built 1903 of steel, Veritas; dimensions, 414.4 feet by 50.6 feet by 29.5 feet, molded; 9.96 knots on 38 T. consumption; triple twin crew engines; cylinders, 21½ inch, 33 inch, 52 inch by 35½-inch stroke; water ballast, 1,202 tons; electric light; 2 decks and awning deck; accommodations for 45 first-class passengers, 48 third-class passengers; bunks, including hospital, 496.

Gross registry, 6,474; net registry, 4,214; price, \$300,000. Under French registry.

No. 35.

6,825 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 25.5-foot draft; built 1902 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 382½ feet by 47 feet 2 inches by 37½ feet, molded; cubic capacity, 376,540 cubic feet; 10/10½ knots on 25 tons consumption per day; triple engines; cylinders, 26 inch, 43 inch, 72 inch by 48-inch stroke; 2 S. E. boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast, 1,785 tons; C. D. B. and peaks; 5 hatches; 10 steam winches; between decks, 8 feet; 2 decks laid with poop; bridge and T. G. fore-castle; coefficient, '77.

Gross registry, 4,268; net registry, 2,773; price, \$250,000.

No. 36.

7,415 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 25.4-foot draft; built 1900 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 405 feet by 48.7 feet by 32 feet 3 inches, molded; cubic capacity, 373,000 cubic feet; 10 knots on 28 tons consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 27 inch, 44½ inch, 74 inch by 54-inch stroke; 2 D. E. boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast, 1,900 tons; C. D. B. and peaks; 5 hatches; 10 steam winches; 8 derricks; between decks, 8.4 feet; 2 decks laid with poop; bridge and T. G. fore-castle; 16 cargo ports.

Gross registry, 4,808; net registry, 3,112; price, \$225,000.

Above ships (Nos. 35 and 36) are under British registry.

The parties in England who have listed these ships with me say these boats are now trading under time charter and are expected to arrive in New York about the end of the month of January. They could not, however, be delivered in the States now, as they are committed to load in Baltimore in February. Owners would, however, be willing to sell, with delivery in England, about March or April next, and brokers offer to send inspection order to be used on arrival in New York.

No. 37.

3,297 gross ton; built of steel, 1895; dimensions taken from Lloyd's Register; 330 feet by 43 feet by 18.4 feet, 29 feet molded depth; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 24 inches, 38 inches, 64 inches, by 42-inch stroke; 160 pounds working pressure. A. P. T. 118 T. 100 A1 Lloyd's. Under Danish registry. Price, \$210,000.

No. 38.

2,598 gross ton; built, 1897, of steel; dimensions, 312.5 feet by 45 feet by 20.5 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 22 inches, 35 inches, 57 inches by 39-inch stroke. These dimensions taken from Lloyd's Register, W. B. Under Danish Registry. Price, \$182,500.

No. 39.

2,157 gross ton; built, 1888, of steel; dimensions, 279 feet by 37.7 feet by 19.1 feet; molded depth, 21 feet 8 inches; figures taken from Lloyd's Register; triple engines; cylinders, 22½ inches, 36 inches, 58 inches by 39-inch stroke; 160 pounds working pressure; W. B. & Cell. D. B. 240, A. P. T. 40 T. 100 A1 Lloyd's. Under Danish registry. Price, \$110,000.

No. 40.

1,316 gross ton; built, 1910, of steel; dimensions, 231.5 feet by 36.2 feet by 14.4 feet; figures taken from Lloyd's Register; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 16½ inches, 27 inches, 44 inches by 30-inch stroke, W. B. Under Danish registry. Price, \$130,000.

No. 41.

2,025 gross ton; built, 1907, of steel; dimensions, 284 by 42 by 18.4 feet; molded depth 28.1; figures taken from Lloyd's Register; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 20½ inches, 33 inches, 55½ inches by 35½-inch stroke; 185 pounds working pressure; intermediate bulkhead in fore hold dispensed with; 4 B. H. only; W. B. Cell. D. Ba. 88 feet, A. P. T. 150 T. 100 A1 Lloyd's; electric light; one deck, steel, and deep framing and awning deck, steel. Ship is offered for sale subject to purchaser overtaking time charter for one year commencing May, 1915, on contract of £17,000 sterling. Under Danish registry. Price, \$250,000.

No. 42.

1,065 gross ton; built, 1904, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions from Lloyd's Register; 200.5 feet by 32 feet by 14.6 feet; depth molded 22.3 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 15 inches, 26 inches, 42 inches by 30-inch stroke; 180 pounds working pressure; W. B. & Cell. D. Ba., A. P. T. 6 T. F. P. T. 46 T.; electric light; one deck, steel; spar deck, steel; and deep framing; cable says delivery prompt, England. Under Norwegian registry. Price, \$75,000.

No. 43.

1,672 gross ton. Steamer offered under Spanish registry, delivery to be made at Barcelona immediately. Not listed in Lloyd's or Veritas, but have seen name of ship in weekly publication. Price, \$105,000.

No. 44.

3,520 gross ton; built, 1895, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 344 feet by 44.5 feet by 25.8 feet; depth molded 28.6 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 25 inches, 41 inches, 67 inches by 45-inch stroke; 170 pounds working pressure; W. B. & Cell. D. Ba., A. P. T., 2 decks and deep framing; 3 deck rule; electric light. Under Norwegian registry. Price, \$230,000.

No. 45.

3,569 gross ton; built, 1896, of steel; dimensions taken from Lloyd's Register, 344.5 feet by 44.7 feet by 25.7 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 23 inches, 37 inches, 60 inches by 54-inch stroke; W. B.; two decks. Under Norwegian registry. Price, \$230,000.

No. 46.

3,314 gross ton; built, 1899, of steel; dimensions taken from Lloyd's Register, 336 feet by 46.1 feet by 24 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 21½ inches, 37 inches, 62 inches by 45-inch stroke; W. B.; turret deck. Under Italian registry. Price, \$160,000.

No. 47.

4,158 gross ton; built, 1899, of steel; dimensions taken from Lloyd's Register, 360.2 feet by 48.2 feet by 20.3 feet; depth molded 30.11 feet; triple engines; 3 cylinders, 23½ inches, 38½ inches, 68 inches by 48-inch stroke; 200 pounds working pressure; one deck, steel, and spar deck; 100 A1 Lloyd's. Under Italian registry. Price, \$210,000.

No. 48.

2,913 gross tons; built 1883, of iron; dimensions, taken from Lloyd's Register, 299.8 feet by 40.1 feet by 28.5 feet; depth, molded, 29.10 feet; triple engines, 3 cylinders, 21½ inch, 35½ inch, 58½ inch, by 48-inch stroke; water ballast; one deck and spar deck. Letter in regard to boat says she is built of steel and loads about 4,200 tons dead weight, all told; delivery to be made in Norway on all-cash payment. Price, \$120,000. Under Norwegian registry.

No. 49.

2,121 gross tons; built 1901, of steel; 100 A1, Lloyd's; dimensions, 284 feet by 38 feet by 21 feet; mean draft, fully laden, 20.2 feet; cubic cargo capacity, including spare bunkers, 2,312 tons of 40 cubic feet; dead weight, 1,970; bunkers, 435; spare bunkers, 190; passenger accommodations for 37 first, 8 second, 52 steerage; triple compound engine, amidships, cylinders 22-inch, 37-inch, 59-inch, by 39-inch stroke; indicated horsepower, 1,100; nominal, 268. Price, \$120,500. Under Dutch registry.

No. 50.

2,108 gross tons; built 1897, of steel; 100 A1, Lloyd's; dimensions, 282 by 37 by 20.4 feet; mean draft, fully laden, 20.1 feet; cubic cargo capacity, including spare bunkers, 2,260 tons of 40 cubic feet; dead weight, 2,055; bunkers, 410 tons; spare bunkers, 180; passenger accommodations for 34 first-class, 8 second-class, 33 steerage; triple compound engine, amidships, cylinders 22-inch, 35-inch, 59-inch, by 39-inch stroke; indicated horsepower, 1,000; nominal, 260. Price, \$87,500. Under Dutch registry.

No. 51.

Built 1907, of steel; dimensions, 230 by 31.1 by 20.3 feet; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 1,261; one deck; 1,550 tons dead weight; 74,500 cubic feet; draft, loaded, 16.9 feet; triple engines, cylinders 19-inch, 30-inch, 50-inch, by 33-inch stroke; consumption, 20 tons American; speed, 11½ knots. Price, 302,500 kroner. Under Swedish registry.



## No. 52.

Built 1907, of steel; dimensions, 240 feet by 35 feet by 17.10 feet; Lloyd's, A1; registered tonnage, 1,360/830; one deck and bridge deck; dead weight, 2,150 tons; 103,900 cubic feet; 4 hatches; water ballast, 345 tons; draft, loaded, 17.4½ feet; triple engines; horsepower, 855; indicated; cylinders 18-inch, 20-inch, 48-inch, by 33-inch stroke; 180 pounds working pressure; 14 to 15 tons consumption; speed, 10 knots; bunker capacity, 145 tons; steam winches, 4.

Price, 352,000 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 53.

Built 1894, of steel; dimensions, 310.1 feet by 40.5 feet by 17 feet; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 3,021/1,837; one deck; dead weight, 4,600 tons; 219,633 cubic feet; 4 hatchways; water ballast, 535 tons; draft, loaded, 21.6 feet; triple engines, amidships, cylinders 23-inch, 36-inch, 57-inch, by 42-inch stroke; boilers, 2, S. E.; heating surface, 4,000; working pressure, 160 pounds; consumption, 18 tons; speed, 9½ knots; 9 steam winches.

Price, 440,000 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 54.

Built 1904, of steel; dimensions, 259.1 feet by 36 feet by 19.9 feet; Lloyd's, A1; registered tonnage, 1,693/1,015; 2 decks; 2 holds; dead weight, 2,300 tons; 2 hatchways; water ballast, 394 tons; draft, loaded, 17.1 feet; triple engines, cylinders 19-inch, 31-inch, 51-inch, by 36-inch stroke; 2 boilers; working pressure, 180 pounds; consumption, 13 W.; speed, 9 knots; bunker capacity, 250 tons; donkey boiler; 8 steam winches; cabin passengers, 8.

Price, \$110,000. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 55.

Built 1890, of steel; dimensions, 340 feet by 42.6 feet by 28.3 feet; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 2,317/2,136; 2 decks, iron and shade; 5 holds; dead weight, 4,720 tons; 309,485 cubic feet; 5 hatchways; water ballast, 833 tons; draft, loaded, 24.7½ feet; triple engines, cylinders 26-inch, 42-inch, 67-inch, by 51-inch stroke; 2 boilers, D. E., very good; working pressure, 160 pounds; consumption, 27 tons; speed, 11 knots; bunker capacity, 694 tons; donkey boiler; 5 steam winches.

Price, \$101,750. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 56.

Built (?), of steel; dimensions, 277/265 feet by 42 feet by 20 feet; registered tonnage, 1,823/1,099; 1 deck; well deck; 2 holds; 4 bulkheads; dead weight, 3,000 tons; 141,850 cubic feet; 4 hatches; water ballast, 604 tons; draft, loaded, 17 feet 7 inches; triple engines, amidships, cylinders 20-inch, 33-inch, 56-inch, by 36-inch stroke; 2 boilers, S. E., 180 pounds working pressure; consumption, 17 tons; speed 10 to 11 knots; 5 steam winches.

Price, 577,500 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 57.

Built 1907, of steel; dimensions, 287 feet by 44 feet by 19 feet 8 inches; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 2,152/1,311; 1 deck; 2 holds; dead weight, 3,730 tons; 164,045 cubic feet; 4 hatchways; water ballast, 731 tons; draft, loaded, 18 feet; triple engines, amidships, cylinders 21-inch, 35-inch, 57-inch, by 39-inch stroke; 2 boilers, S. E.; heating surface, 3,248; working pressure, 160 pounds; consumption, 15 best Welsh coal; speed, 9 knots; 4 steam winches.

Price, 501,000 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 58.

Built 1890, of steel; dimensions, 299 feet by 40 feet 2 inches by 20 feet 2 inches; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 2,631/1,670; 1 deck; 6 bulkheads; dead weight, 3,800 tons; 187,241 cubic feet; 4 hatchways; water ballast, 502 tons; draft, loaded, 21 feet; triple engines, amidships, cylinders 22-inch, 36-inch, 59-inch, by 42-inch stroke; 2 boilers; working pressure, 160 pounds; consumption, 16 to 17; speed 9 knots; steam winches, 4.

Price, 657,500 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

## No. 59.

Built 1903, of steel; dimensions, 281 feet 6 inches by 40 feet by 22 feet; 100 A1, Lloyd's; registered tonnage, 2,035/1,309; 1 deck; 3 holds; 5 bulkheads; dead weight, 3,200 tons; 4 hatchways; water ballast, 550 tons; draft, loaded, 18 feet 6 inches; triple engines, amidships, cylinders 21-inch, 35-inch, 57-inch, by 39-inch stroke; 2 boilers, S. E.; working pressure, 160 pounds; consumption, 14 tons; speed, 9 knots; steam winches, 4.

Price, 495,000 kroner. Under Swedish registry.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have here something which I should be willing to have read, but I presume it is sufficient to insert it in the RECORD. The Secretary of the Treasury delivered an interesting address before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on the 4th of February, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY MADDOX BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1915.

"Before I begin my speech I want to take exception to the statement of your presiding officer that the Secretary of the Treasury is not a seafaring man. He unconsciously betrayed in that statement the ignorance on the part of the American public at large of the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is the oldest seafaring man in the history of the American Government. Since 1790 the Secretary of the Treasury has been the head of the most unique and gallant and remarkable service known to the history of the nations, the Revenue-Cutter Service. It was the inception of the American Navy, and to-day there is not a sailor who faces the wintry or the summer sea, nor a passenger who is bound homeward or outward upon one of those great ocean liners, who does not feel safer and more secure because he knows that that service, maintained by the American people, is on guard to protect him against the disasters of the sea. And this gives me

an opportunity of saying, ladies and gentlemen, that when criticism is made of this bill because the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury are made members of the proposed shipping board that you are putting men at the head of this commission who do not know anything about the sea or anything about the shipping business, it is an error.

"I am not here to appeal for a place on the shipping board. That is the last thing I want myself—and when I speak of the Secretary of the Treasury I am not speaking of myself, but of the office and of the duties that devolve upon it and of the appropriateness in any enterprise of this character of having these two men, these two Government officials, charged with great responsibilities in connection with the shipping interests of this country, upon that board.

"In the first place, the Secretary of Commerce has charge of all the lighthouses in this country; he has charge of the light-house-tender service of this country, running a fleet of vessels in connection with that service, and he is bound to know something about the shipping business. He comes intimately into contact with it at various points of the compass. The Secretary of the Treasury, in the command and direction of that splendid fleet of 44 vessels, whose value in the aggregate is as large as that of many of the merchant fleets of the world—and greater than any of them in the service that it performs—must have knowledge in very considerable degree of the shipping business. He, with the Secretary of Commerce, enforces the navigation laws of this country. He, in connection with the Secretary of Commerce, deals with every ship's manifest that is filed in this country. I might enumerate the manifold points at which these two great departments come into intimate touch with the merchant marine of all the nations in the world, making it necessary both for the heads of these departments and for their staffs to keep in close connection and relationship with the shipping interests of all the nations that have intercourse with the United States of America.

"Objection has been made against this bill that the Government may make a loss if it goes into the shipping business. I do not think the Government will make a loss. But are we to be determined in our action about great and vital national policies by the question as to whether or not we may lose or make a few hundred dollars or a few thousand dollars?

"Let me illustrate by the Revenue-Cutter Service. In the last year, 1914, it cost \$2,500,000, approximately, to keep those vessels in service. Under the regulations of the department no revenue cutter can stay in port over 24 hours without an explanation to the department. Why? Because its function is to keep upon the high seas, to save life and property, as well as to protect our coast against smuggling and other offenses. The revenue cutters, in saving vessels at sea, do a salvage business without charge, and wrecking and salvage companies have complained that the Government is engaged in private business, competing with private wrecking and salvage companies, but should we abandon the Revenue-Cutter Service for this reason?

"In the year 1914 the Revenue-Cutter Service saved nearly \$10,000,000 of shipping property in peril at sea, and it saved, in addition to that, 450 or more priceless human lives; and yet, would you say, gentlemen, that the Revenue-Cutter Service should be abolished because it costs this Government money to maintain it? Are we governed by such sordid considerations that nothing should be done by the Government unless a profit is received? Why did we build the Panama Canal, in which we have invested over \$375,000,000? Did we do that because we expected to make a financial profit for this Nation? Would we have hesitated to enter upon that great work because we could not see at the end of it an actual money return upon our investment? Where the vital interests of this Nation are at stake, where the lives of its citizens are involved, where the property of its subjects is put in peril by the seas or otherwise, it is the function of government, regardless of cost, to come to the relief of its people.

"And so, my friends, when American commerce is to-day in jeopardy; when, through acts of belligerent nations in which the innocent American people had no part, freight rates are soaring to impossible heights, hampering our commerce, affecting our material as well as our financial interests, affecting, in large measure, the actual life of the Nation itself, I confess that I have no patience with the idea that the American Government must sit with fettered feet and trammelled hands and refuse to protect the American farmer, the American business man, and the American producer in circumstances of this kind.

"My friends, there are times in the life of every nation when it is necessary that every power of the Government shall be exercised to protect the property, the rights, and the lives of its citizens, and this is a time when we must face this issue squarely and when we must not, because of any hidebound



dogma or any academic theories, or any fears that this or that thing may happen, hesitate to go straight forward in the path of duty, and do the things that are necessary to be done, and do them at the time that it is necessary to do them, because remedies are not worth a continental unless they are applied when the disease is at the acute stage.

"Now, we are at the acute stage. Since August, 1914, our commerce has been seriously affected by the conditions which have arisen on the other side of the water. In response to a Senate resolution, the Secretary of Commerce and myself made a report to the Senate a few days ago, and I want to read to you a few things in this report which will convey to you more strikingly than any words of mine can possibly convey, the conditions that affect American shipping interests, American farmers, American manufacturers, and American business men in general who are interested in our export and import trade.

"These letters were sent to the two departments without any direct request whatever for information. They were voluntarily sent in response to the request in the Senate resolution that these two departments, connected as they are with the shipping and business interests of the country, should furnish all available information.

"Garcia & Co., general commission merchants of San Francisco, wrote under date of January 5, as follows:

"We beg to say that we ourselves have shipped in the last two months 500 or 600 tons of dried fruit to New York, through the canal at Panama, for reshipment to Scandinavian ports, and also to Holland. To a great extent these goods have been in New York for a long time, for the reason that our forwarding agents, Messrs. C. B. Richards & Co., could not get any space. It seems that whenever the Scandinavian-American Line are asking higher freight rates, other lines do so, too, and now even the Holland-American Line is asking 100 shillings for 2,240 pounds, while only a few days ago this company asked 45 shillings for 2,240 pounds. These advances in freight rates are made without notice, and even previous engagements have not been protected. So that the shippers, instead of making a small profit on their sales to European countries, are losing money.

"And yet I have heard it seriously contended, although I know I need not discuss such a proposition with intelligent American business men, that freight rates, ocean transportation rates, do not make any difference to our business men, because the man on the other side pays it. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who has anything to do with business who does not know that the cost of transportation is an elemental and serious factor in every business transaction involving the shipment or movement of goods.

"William Haas & Sons, manufacturers and exporters of 'D' shovel handles, Houston Heights, Tex., December 28, 1914:

"For years our entire output has been disposed of abroad, but owing to the present prohibitive tariffs in ocean transportation we are unable to deliver our goods, consequently our plant will remain closed down until such rates are established as will enable us to market our goods. \* \* \* In our judgment a Government merchant marine will solve the problem.

"Charles E. Moore, president Leaf Tobacco Association, Baltimore, Md., December 28, 1914:

"\* \* \* I desire to file with your department an urgent protest against the unwarranted advance in freight rates on tobacco as recently established by the Holland-American Line. Some of our exporting members shipping to Holland points have signed contracts with this company, expiring December 31, 1914, for a rate of \$3.50 per hoghead of tobacco. This contract has been disregarded entirely and the rate increased first to \$5.25, then to \$6.85, and to-day a notice that it will be \$7.50 until further notice. This, I repeat, in the face of the written contract for \$3.50 per hoghead.

"Gano, Moore & Co., coal, coke, iron, steel, ores, Philadelphia, Pa., December 28, 1914:

"The shortage of vessels is so serious now that it is practically stopping the exportation of coal. We have several orders for coal, principally to South American ports, and it is impossible to secure vessels.

"American Tripoli Co., 'Tripoli' flour, Seneca, Mo., December 28, 1914:

"We have an offer of some orders from Barcelona, Spain, and the first two of the attached letters refer to our effort to get quoted us a rate from New Orleans to Barcelona; and you will see that the steamship company operating steamers to Barcelona refuse to quote rates at all. In the first letter the reason given was that other commodities which permit of a higher rate are being carried, so that our material, which must have a lower rate, is not at all desirable, and they even refuse to quote rates at all. \* \* \* The fourth letter, dated December 18, quotes us a rate of 49 cents per 100 pounds from New Orleans to Havre, France, and for comparison will say that just previous to the European war, on July 3, 1914, we made a shipment at the rate of 18 cents per 100 pounds, a little more than one-third of the rate now asked. This high rate is, of course, prohibitive on a commodity such as ours.

"Inman, Akers & Inman, Atlanta, Ga., December 28, 1914:

"We are paying ocean freight from Savannah to Rotterdam and to Bremen of \$2.22, to \$3 per hundredweight. Formerly the rates to these places were about 35 cents per hundredweight on cotton.

"W. B. Cooper & Co., cotton merchants, Wilmington, N. C., December 31, 1914:

"Please allow us to indorse the action of the administration in trying to secure boats for the movement of American products. We are frank to say that as a general proposition we are not anxious to

see the United States Government get into too many lines of business, but when 3 cents per pound or more is to be paid freight on cotton across the water against 35 cents per hundred pounds six months ago it is time something should be done, in our opinion. (Three cents per pound equals \$15 per bale; 35 cents per hundredweight equals \$1.75 per bale.)

"T. F. Jennings, hardwood manufacturer, Marianna, Fla., December 28, 1914:

"I am exporting hickory lumber in bundles to Christiania, Norway, and freight rates have become so exorbitant that it is almost out of the question to ship. \* \* \* Now, I am compelled, under the circumstances, to shut down my business if this can not be rectified.

"Funch, Edye & Co., steamship agents and ship brokers, in a letter to T. F. Jennings, Marianna, Fla., December 14, 1914, state:

"We have no room to offer prior to the steamship *United States*, March 11.

"Chattanooga Wheelbarrow Co., Chattanooga, Tenn., December 26, 1914:

"We have been endeavoring for about a month to get a shipment through some of the Atlantic or Gulf ports for shipment to Bristol or Liverpool. \* \* \* We are still holding this carload trying to get booking through some of the various steamship companies, and in this connection would state we have three more cars which we want to get out early in the year, provided we can get them handled from port.

"Brown & Adams, wool commission merchants, Boston, Mass., December 30, 1914:

"We have been unable to make shipments wool from Buenos Aires to Boston or New York since December 15. Very little chance securing freight room for next 30 days account scarcity of vessels. Have over \$600,000 worth waiting shipment already paid for. Freight rates when available about 150 per cent increase over last year.

"Ike Manheimer, green and dried apples, Rochester, N. Y., December 28, 1914:

"In connection with the Scandinavian-American Line out of New York (Messrs. Funch, Edye & Co., agents), I have had so much trouble in securing space to Copenhagen and in getting the goods on board steamer, even after the space had been promised, that I was compelled to stop selling goods to Copenhagen. \* \* \* The freight on fresh apples in barrels is almost equal to the value of the apples, and practically prohibitive.

"The Norwegian-American Line (Messrs. Benham & Boyesen, agents) has until recently given me very satisfactory service out of New York to points in Norway. \* \* \* but has now also advanced the rates to the above maximum quotations and notified me within a short time that no space is available until next April.

"American Glue Co., Boston, Mass., December 30, 1914:

"Within the past few days, having a shipment of merchandise to export from this port to Liverpool, we were informed by the carriers that they could not handle same at all on account of having more freight than they could handle.

"Phoenix Iron & Steel Co., Galveston, Tex., December 26, 1914:

"\* \* \* We are shippers of old rails and scrap iron and steel. \* \* \* Steamship companies now either quote abnormal freights or refuse to quote at all, so it is impossible to ship any material, as the freights in some cases amount to three-fourths of the delivered price of the commodity.

"L. & E. Frenkel, importers of electric specialties, New York, N. Y., December 31, 1914:

"We procured orders to ship gas coal to Italy, but on account of the high shipping rates we can not ship it.

"J. D. Kremelberg & Co., Baltimore, Md., December 26, 1914:

"We are shippers of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia tobacco to Europe, and most of our shipments are consigned to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway, and Belgium. At present only shipments to Holland, Italy, and Norway are possible at prohibitive rates. In fact, the latter have become so high that now cable orders, 'Stop buying,' have been received.

"Although we have made a yearly contract with the Holland-American Line—the only shipping opportunity from here to Holland—as per copy inclosed, this line has arbitrarily raised its rates 100 to 300 per cent, and even at the raised rates shipments can be booked only for first available room.

"Rates to Italy also have become entirely too high; i. e., from \$4 per hoghead of Maryland tobacco to about \$27, or nearly 3½ cents a pound, so that tobacco shipments have become out of question.

"R. M. Bryan, eastern manager of the Black Diamond, New York, December 30, 1914:

"This business (coal industry) has been almost prostrated by the inability of shippers to secure vessels and upon terms that will permit them to make shipments.

"Henry Lauts & Co., Baltimore, Md., December 29, 1914:

"The present rates charged by this line (Holland-American Line) are almost prohibitive and are a decided menace to the tobacco-export industry of this country.

"Industrial Lumber Co., Elizabeth, La., January 5, 1915:

"We have in the past exported considerable lumber to England, Holland, Germany, and some to France. Since the war, however, we have been unable to make any shipments, primarily because of the uncertainty of securing vessels; also on account of the excessive freight rates.

"Danforth Geer, president Walter A. Wood Mowing & Reaping Machine Co., Hoosick Falls, N. Y., January 9, 1915:

"We find, however, that the cost of getting goods to foreign ports and the uncertainty of proper shipping facilities is becoming a great menace and will have a very serious effect on the business that we have in hand and wish to protect.



" \* \* \* We can not but feel that the steamship companies are taking advantage of present conditions to exact rates which are all out of reason and which are unjust and unfair.

" \* \* \* It would appear to us that there never was a more opportune time for this country, either under legislative action or private capital, to create a merchant marine, for lack of which, in our judgment, this country has suffered for many years. We can only hope that some measures may be enacted or some policy created which will relieve the present situation, and in time to affect our business interests this year.

" G. Stallings & Co., Lynchburg, Va., tobacco exporters, December 28, 1914:

" There is a considerable scarcity of steamers flying the American or neutral flags, and unless more ships can be put at the disposal of shippers, causing a general reduction of ocean freight rates, which are now unreasonable, excessive, and almost prohibitive, the export business of this country is bound to suffer greatly.

" M. B. Nelson, general sales manager the Long-Bell Lumber Co., Kansas City, Mo., December 29, 1914:

" I inclose a quotation from ship brokers, issued under date of December 26, showing rates have advanced more than 300 per cent. \* \* \* We now have in pile at port a little over 9,000,000 feet of lumber, of an approximate value of \$280,000, all of which is deteriorating and could be disposed of if shipping facilities would permit.

" There are many others in the same condition as ourselves, and we sincerely hope you can do something to relieve the situation.

" Panama Railroad Co., January 15, 1915:

" Our stock (of coal) has been reduced from 90,000 to 40,000 tons, and both the Earn Line and our company are scouring the charter market in the effort to secure sufficient tonnage to carry to the Isthmus the amount of coal it is imperative we should keep there.

" Gentlemen, there are something like 75 letters of a similar character in this pamphlet. I do not want to take your time to read them. I wish, indeed, that a copy of this document might be put in the hands of every delegate here, and if it would not be violating the rules of the chamber I should like very much to have permission to send for distribution among the members of this convention copies of this report, which has been printed and issued as a public document by the Senate. It is entitled 'Senate Document No. 673, part 2, Increased Ocean Transportation Rates.'

" Now, as to the effect of these rates. I should like to summarize them very briefly from this report:

" From the foregoing tables it will be observed that ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour, 500 per cent; on cotton, 700 per cent.

" From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent.

" From Baltimore to European ports, excepting Germany, rates have been increased on grain, 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent.

" From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent.

" From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from \$1.25 per bale to \$15 per bale.

" From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent.

" From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

" Since this report was written, gentlemen, freight rates have in many instances been still further increased. Now, it is stated that marine insurance and war-risk insurance have added very greatly to these costs. Let me say to you that the marine insurance rates have been increased one-eighth of 1 per cent only since the war broke out, while war-risk insurance rates have been very much reduced. The war-risk insurance rate to Liverpool is only 2 per cent and to Bremen it is only 3 per cent, made so by the Government of the United States, and if the Government of the United States were not to-day in this privatized kind of private war-risk insurance business, gentlemen, the rates of war-risk insurance would be prohibitive, and they might be stopping American ships altogether. And yet in the face of these uncontroverted facts and with the situation growing more acute every day we stand here and talk and talk and talk while American interests are being put daily into greater jeopardy because some people prefer to be bound by a hoary dogma than to have the Government protect its own citizens and the business men and producers of this country by doing for them what private capital refuses to do.

" Now, gentlemen, I had hoped very much when the shipping question came up that it would not be treated as a partisan question. There is nothing that I deplore more than the fact that this question has, by the action of our politicians—and I use the term not in disrespect, but because it is descriptive—I deeply regret that our politicians have succeeded in making this a partisan question, because it is not a partisan question and no man in this hall and no impartial American mind interested in the welfare of this country ought to be influenced by partisan considerations in passing a deliberative judgment upon it. To show you that it is not a partisan question and has never been

a partisan question, I want to read you what the Democratic and Republican and Progressive platforms said on this question in 1912.

" The Democratic national platform of 1912 said:

" We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of the merchant marine which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people, and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

" The Democratic Party made similar declarations in 1880, 1884, 1904, and 1908; in other words, since 1880 down to the present time it has declared in favor of an American merchant marine. But the party has always stood against subsidies, and that is a very important point to remember in this discussion, because it has a material bearing upon the possibility of getting any remedy whatever for existing conditions.

" The Republican Party said in 1912:

" We believe that one of the country's most urgent needs is a revived merchant marine.

" But I judge, from what is happening up there on the hill, that they have not read this platform lately.

" There should be American ships, and plenty of them—

" They are not satisfied with American ships; they want plenty of them—

" To make use of the great American oceanic canal now nearing completion.

" They have reiterated those declarations for the last 30 years.

" The Progressive Party, while it did not come out specifically for a merchant marine in express terms, had this to say:

" The time has come when the Federal Government should cooperate with manufacturers and producers in extending our foreign commerce.

" That is one thing in the Progressive platform that I thoroughly approve.

" To this end we demand adequate appropriations by Congress and the appointment of diplomatic and consular officers solely with a view to their special fitness and worth and not in consideration of political expediency. It is imperative to the welfare of our people that we enlarge and extend our foreign commerce. We are preeminently fitted to do this because as a people we have developed high skill in the art of manufacturing; our business men are strong executives and strong organizers. In every way possible our Federal Government should cooperate in this important matter.

" I want to read you now just one more section from the Republican platform of 1900. Here is what they said:

" Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign-carrying trade is a great loss to the industry of this country.

" They admitted it was a great loss to the industry of this country.

" It is also a serious danger to our trade—

" Mind you, this was 14 years ago. This fellow had sense—

" It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

" Now, gentlemen, that is a singularly distinct and a singularly prophetic declaration in that platform of one of our political parties—the platform of the party which was then dominant in this country and had control in 1900. Yes, sir; they had control of both branches of the Congress, if I am not mistaken, Senator [addressing Senator BURTON], and they were in position to legislate upon this important question.

" Did they do anything? If so, I have not heard of it. And if they had carried out that statesmanlike utterance—and I am liberal enough always to give my political opponents, even, credit—if they had carried out that really statesmanlike utterance—because the man who wrote that had the vision of a seer and the imagination of a statesman—if they had carried that out, I venture to say that American commerce, American foreign trade, would be double what it is to-day.

" Of course that is an opinion; I can not prove it; but I am just as satisfied as I am that I am talking here that that would have been the result, and I say that it would have paid the American people to have contributed any reasonable amount for that purpose.

" That brings us back to the question of subsidy. The Republican Party favored a subsidy. Why did they not give us a subsidy? Why did they not do it? They had the power to do it. For 14 years, gentlemen, since that declaration was made, we have sat like knots on a log and done nothing.

" When you have an administration that is willing to do something for the American business man are you going to support it or are you not?

" I am not wedded to Government ownership and operation of anything. I do not want to see the American Government engaged in any activity where private capital, upon reasonable



terms, will come in, but I am opposed to the American Government sitting still in the face of an acute crisis when our vital interests are at stake and waiting for the benevolence of private capital to come in and rescue us from a critical situation, when, for more than 50 years, private capital has refused to do anything to relieve the situation.

"When I think of this shipping business and of the claim of private capital to further consideration, it reminds me very much of that famous colloquy between Weber and Fields in New York some years ago. Fields proposed to Weber—who was always the goat—that they organize a 'skindicate.' Mind you, a 'skindicate,' to go into the shipping business. After some parley Weber said, 'Vell, where do I come in?' Fields said, 'Vell, I furnish ze ocean and you furnish ze ships.'

"Private capital has furnished the ocean for 50 years, but who has furnished the ships? Our foreign competitors, who master the seas and who to-day have the entire power to destroy American commerce or to retard it, as they see fit, because they can lift the rates over night and there is no power to control them—and they are doing it over night and putting them at such prohibitive figures that they can stop any export they want to from this country to-day. And we sit here and gabble about whether the Government shall or shall not come in and relieve the situation.

"Eleven hundred per cent! Why, even a banker would call that excessive. And they put that on cotton, when the poor people in the South are groaning and grinding under the load that was saddled on them by the first cannon shot that echoed throughout Europe; and we sit here and talk about the Government not coming to the front and doing something to relieve the situation.

"What is government for? Is it something in a strait-jacket? Is it sitting in a corner like a concrete thing with palsied hands, afraid to act, or is it something vital? Is it a flexible instrument in the hands of the people of this country, to be used within constitutional limitations for their relief and benefit? Is it intended to be something to act in this emergency, something to come to the front and do things for the American people when private capital can not be commanded or commanded or persuaded for that purpose? Why, my friends, it does not seem to me that there is room for argument. This shipping bill seems to be a matter of such vital consequence to somebody—I am not questioning motives, gentlemen, and I do not want you to understand me as indulging in innuendo, because I do not; I impute no motives to anyone; I do not believe in winning that way. I would not get a vote out of this Chamber in favor of this bill by an argument that I felt would be demeaning to myself or to the Government, but I do want to say with all the sincerity that I can command, that for some reason somebody is more concerned about the Government not relieving this situation than they have been about anything that has come before the American people within my lifetime or within my knowledge, except the currency bill.

"Now, I want to say this about the currency bill, and it is very apropos. We talked about a revision of the currency for something like 30 or 40 years. In the meantime we sat still and did nothing. We literally did nothing except talk. While we talked we paid the penalty in untold millions of loss, in panic after panic, for our stupidity and our lack of courage. Finally this administration took hold of the currency question. The section of the country to-day that is most opposed to this shipping bill was most opposed to the currency bill. I believe it was because they did not understand the measure. They did not know what the currency bill meant, and we had to fight every night and day for nearly six months—continuous fighting—to get the Federal reserve act passed; and I want to read you just one little paragraph in connection with the Federal reserve act from a speech which was made in Congress about a month before it was passed. [After glancing at speech referred to.] Why, this was made only 10 days before it passed. Here is what was said:

"I say that this bill presents a financial heresy twice repudiated by the people of the United States. I say that the central reserve board appointed under this bill will have to represent that very heresy. If this bill passes as it stands, America stands to lose all she saved when Grant vetoed the inflation bill, all we saved when Grover Cleveland abolished the silver purchase, all we saved when we elected McKinley, all the Republicans and all the gold Democrats saved when they helped in the repudiation of the vital principle which has been put into this bill.

"That rather startling declaration had relation to the character of the Federal reserve notes, and the earnest and solemn statement made with impressive warning to the people of America in this very speech was that the Federal reserve notes were 'fiat money or greenbacks!' And yet there is nothing in this country, not even a Government bond—I say it advisedly,

because I know; this is one thing I really know—that even a Government bond is not as secure as a Federal reserve note. It has not got as large assets back of it; no Government bond has. And yet this gentleman solemnly warned the American people that these notes were greenbacks, and that they were going to repeat the very financial heresy which for years had been prevented from being grafted upon the people of this country.

"Who do you suppose made that speech? One of the most distinguished men in the Republican Party—a man for whose ability and intelligence I have the greatest respect. That man was the senior Senator from the State of New York—Senator ELIHU ROOR; and that is what he said about the currency bill 10 days before it was enacted into law.

"I want to read you, gentlemen, what I happened to see the other day in a paper that I read every once in a while, to see if I am getting too progressive—because this paper is so reactionary that it is enough to pull a fellow into a hole if he will read it long enough. Here is a paper that fought the Federal reserve act from A to izzard—one of many. I am told that the sentiment against the shipping bill in the city of New York and in the city of Boston is unanimous. It does not surprise me. The sentiment in each of those cities was similarly unanimous against the Federal reserve act. It is due to the fact—[Cries of 'No!' 'No!']

"I say I am told so. I am glad to hear you deny it, gentlemen, because I got this from some politician or some newspaper, and whenever a politician or a newspaper tells me anything I am inclined to believe it! I am glad to hear that it is not accurate.

"Here is what this paper said the other day—the Federal reserve banks had been in operation for only two months—and here is what it said:

"The Federal reserve bank is the reliance of the present—

"My goodness, what has happened to this fellow?—

"and the promise of the future.

"Think of it! In a year absolutely turned around, admitting that the administration knew what it was doing when it passed the Federal reserve act. He says:

"It is the promise of the future, as the clearing house was in the past—

"The clearing house does not come within a mile of the Federal reserve act—

"Its first report is the starting point of a new banking dispensation, in which panics are to be prevented rather than cured. In some respects the Federal Reserve System is the enactment of the clearing-house system.

"Of course they do not like to say unreservedly that they did not make a great impression upon the character of this bill, and therefore they want to tell us it is rather a beautified clearing-house system; but it is deeper than that.

"I will not read any more of that. It is significant of the change of opinion that has come over the country since that act was passed; and yet, my friends, let me say to you that if that act had not been passed and nothing had been done with our currency system—and I speak somewhat advisedly, because I think there has not been a minute of the time since that fateful day in July last when the first declaration of war was made in Europe to the present time when the great department over which I have the honor to preside has not had to be intimately in touch with every part of financial business in this country—I say to you advisedly that if it had not been for that great measure, that great constructive measure, the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, even as modified by that act, would not have saved this situation, and there is no telling what penalty the American people would be paying to-day for the neglect of the American Congress to give them that very vital and necessary measure of protection. I violate no confidence, gentlemen, when I say that if it had not been for President Wilson standing almost single-handed and alone against the advice of many strong and influential men in this country, who earnestly and honestly believed, as a matter of judgment, that the Congress ought to adjourn after the passage of the tariff law, this act might not have been upon the statute books even by this time. But it was because, with that singular prescience of his, a singular power, a wise divination, so to speak, he insisted that the Congress remain in session until action was taken upon a measure which was absolutely vital to the business interests of the people of this country, that this great law was passed.

"My friends, am I unreasonable when I say to you that the gentlemen who are so strenuously opposing the shipping bill may be similarly mistaken? The opposition comes from the same interests that denounced the currency act. What possible harm can come to you business men—I want somebody to answer this—what possible harm can come to you business men if the



Government steps in in this emergency to relieve the situation, to protect you against the eventualities of war, to save your commerce and your business. Because I tell you now, and I make the prediction with confidence, that if this bill is not passed there is not a man in this audience who will not rise up and denounce himself inside of 12 months because he would not allow us to do the things that were necessary to save him.

"What carries your commerce to-day? What is the protection of American commerce to-day? It is the flag of one nation—a nation involved in war, at that—the British flag. That is the only thing that stands between you and complete cessation of your export and import trade. I mean almost complete cessation, because more than 50 per cent of the bottoms in service to-day upon the seas sail under the English flag. Once you put that flag in more serious jeopardy than it is to-day, what is going to happen to you? What will happen to you? You may have a complete cessation of your export trade. Do you know what that means? It means disaster throughout this country; it means absolute disaster, because if you are deprived of the opportunity of selling your surplus at reasonable or profitable prices, what are you going to have at home? Simply panic and disaster and trouble. Yet, when the sure salvation of your situation is to let the Government come in and do this thing in your interests, you hesitate.

"Since I have come to Washington there is one word in the English language with which I have become more familiar than any other, because it is the one word that is used most. I say that advisedly. I use it myself too much, and every time I use it I get ashamed of myself. You can talk to any man about anything and the first thing he says is 'I am afraid of so and so and so and so.' He is afraid of something. Where is the courage of the American Nation? Where is that virile power that has made this American Nation great? Has it disappeared? I do not believe it. We are not afraid of anything, my friends, so long as we walk the path of rectitude and justice as a nation, and we intend to do that; and if this shipping bill passes, all this talk about getting into international difficulties is mere twaddle. Why, my friends, there is no more danger of getting into international difficulties if this bill is passed than there is that I will pick up the Washington Monument and walk across the Potomac River with it. Let us get rid of this bogey now and forever. The American Government is going to stand upon its plain rights, which are the rights of justice and neutrality, and if there is a man in the United States of America who is a firmer friend of peace or who has stood more strongly and courageously for it than the President of the United States, I would like to be introduced to him.

"Now, gentlemen, on the question of international relations I wish to say this: I do not know of any protests that have been filed by any foreign Government against this shipping bill. This is a matter of domestic concern, in which no foreign nation has the right to say one word. This is a matter of policy for this country alone to determine. The execution of that policy is another question. The execution of that policy means that we have to observe the rules of international law and the conditions of neutrality. That being done, nobody can complain. Can this Nation ever surrender to anybody the power to protect itself and its own citizens? Who proposes that—who means it seriously? I do not believe that any man could mean any such thing seriously; and yet there are speeches in Congress where it has been seriously suggested.

"Why, the historic position that this country has taken ever since its existence is in favor of the right to do the very things that we are attempting in this shipping bill. But if anybody is sensitive about the exercise of that right, let me call his attention to one or two things that have been done. Shortly after the war began, recognizing the serious and grave situation that confronted this country, because of the paralysis of shipping and the complete disorganization of international credits, the Secretary of the Treasury on the 7th day of August, three days after the first serious effects of the involvement of all of these nations in war had become apparent, issued a call to the country asking for the cooperation of the responsible bankers and business men and shipping men in an effort to accomplish two things: First, to restore our shipping so that grain, which was piled up in every port on the Atlantic and Gulf seaboard, could be moved; and, second, to reestablish foreign exchange upon a normal basis. In response to that call, gentlemen came to the Treasury Department representing in the highest degree the business interests of this country. I wish I had time to read all their names to you, but I am obliged to read just a few. Among them were Mr. J. A. Farrell, of New York, and Mr. P. A. S. Franklin, of New York. Mr. Farrell is the president of the United States Steel Corporation. Mr. Franklin is the vice president of the International Mercantile Marine Co. Mr.

Bernard Baker, of Baltimore, well known in the shipping world, a gentleman who has no interests of any kind in the shipping business, and who is interested in this great question purely as an American citizen, and who knows the vitality of the question and the necessity of acting promptly upon it, was also present, as were also Mr. Robert Dollar, of San Francisco, Mr. Hemphill, of New York, and many other prominent men, including President Fahey, of Boston, who is now the president of this Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

"Now, gentlemen, that conference passed several resolutions. I am going to read you two that have a bearing on this question:

"Resolved, That this conference urge the United States Government to establish a bureau of war-risk insurance, to be administered under the direction of a suitable Government department by a board of three or five members, which shall assume the risks of war on American vessels and American cargoes shipped or to be shipped therein whenever, in the judgment of the board, it shall appear that American vessels or shippers in American vessels are unable in any particular trade to compete on equal terms with the vessels or shippers of other nationalities by reason of the protection offered such other carriers or shippers by arrangements for indemnity through their Governments; and that such board have power to fix rates of premium.

"That resulted in the enactment of the war-risk insurance measure to which I have already referred.

"Resolved, That the present opportunity to extend American foreign trade and the opportunity now to begin the creation of a mercantile marine under the United States flag is so great that this conference appeals to Congress by immediate and effective legislation and by necessary changes in our navigation laws to make it possible for our citizens, without discrimination, to buy and operate ships under American registry in foreign trade on equal competitive terms with all other maritime nations.

"Those were significant declarations by men prominent in the business and banking world, most of them not Democrats in politics—men willing to put aside partisan considerations and come here to Washington and ask this Government to go, first, into private business for the purpose of protecting the shippers of this country, because war-risk insurance in times like these is just as essential a part of the shipping business as the steel plates in the hull of the vessel, and no vessel will go to sea without war-risk insurance any more than it would go to sea without a crew. And here they ask this Government to go into private business to protect the American business man. When that matter came before Congress it was voted for by Democrats and Republicans alike. It was passed by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio is one of the men who voted for it, or, at least, he is not recorded against it. There was opposition in the House, led by Mr. MANN, the Republican leader, but the measure was overwhelmingly passed, and a day or two after that the War Risk Bureau was started. It was made a bureau of the Treasury Department and is actually doing business in insuring American ships.

"Now, they say that the Government can not conduct any business without a loss of efficiency and without extremely great expense. Let me call your attention, gentlemen, to what has happened in the war-risk business. Now, this is mighty private business. It collides with other people who are in the war-risk insurance business. But it was justified. It was the right thing to do. They may say, 'Well, that was only a temporary measure, because it has to expire with the war.' Of course it has to expire with the war. What is war-risk insurance for except for use while the war is in progress, but the principle is the same.

"We have issued up to February 2, 1915—the bureau went into operation on September 2—nearly \$48,000,000 of insurance upon American ships and cargoes, and we have kept the rates down. The premiums we have received to date in actual money paid into the Treasury of the United States amount to \$1,250,000. Earned premiums to date on expired risks are \$397,897, and we have not made a loss yet.

"Now, gentlemen, suppose we had said, 'Oh, well, we will reject this; we can't afford to have the Government engaged in private business,' just as they are saying about the shipping bill: 'You are bound to run this thing at a loss. You will involve the American people in a loss.' Suppose we had done that. Where would we be to-day? I hesitate to tell you what would have happened to the commerce of America if this had not been done. What do you suppose it has cost us to run the bureau up to this time? Mind you, we have taken in \$397,897. You would think \$50,000 very reasonable for handling the bureau during that time, wouldn't you? It has cost us exactly \$6,449.68 to do the business.

"Did we put any conditions in the war-risk insurance bill that we must not issue an insurance policy on an American vessel unless we had the consent of some other power? Not a bit of it. It is our business. We have a right to do this thing. But they say, 'If you are going into the ship business, you will get us into trouble.'



"My friends, when the Government of the United States insures the cargo and the hull of a vessel a policy is issued under the seal of this Government and signed by its responsible executive officer insuring that cargo, and when a vessel and cargo are seized and taken into a prize court this Government has a direct interest in the issue. We insure as much as a million dollars upon any one hull and cargo. Suppose a vessel is seized, as I said before. A million dollars is the equivalent of four good tramp steamships. You could buy four good tramp steamers for a million dollars. So we have, analogously, four ships under this flag belonging to this Government in a prize court in a foreign country. Are we afraid of it? Certainly not. When the Government goes into the war-risk insurance business it goes in as any citizen would go in. It divests itself, to a certain extent, of its sovereignty, because it is engaging in private business; and that is one of the most extreme cases I could cite where a Government has directly gone into a business which might involve it in such complications as these gentlemen fear. But it has no elements of danger, because we expect those cases to be determined in the same way as if they affected any citizen of the world, by the decision of a just prize court, and we can not complain as long as we get justice—and that, of course, we will get.

"We passed a ship-registry bill. There is a lot of cry about free ships. They say, 'Just give us free ships; that is the remedy.' Do you know that you have had free ships since 1912? What effect has the ship-registry bill had on our commerce? Nothing; literally nothing.

"Do you know that under the Panama Canal act you get 'free ships,' and that everything that enters into the furnishing of a ship is 'free'? And yet American capital has not come forward to do anything. Do you know why? The Chamber of Commerce of New York made a report by their experts—I know they are experts, because they say so over their own signatures. They made a report in which they said it cost from 5 to 10 per cent more only, not 40 or 50 per cent, as is commonly understood and alleged as a reason for giving a subsidy to American ships. They said it cost from 5 to 10 per cent more only to operate an American ship as against a foreign ship. You can buy them free in the markets of the world to-day, and operate them in our commerce, except in our coastwise trade. You can buy a ship anywhere and do it.

"When this war broke out a number of American citizens had ships, which they were operating under the British or some other flag—mostly under the British flag. They were anxious to have the law changed to such an extent that those ships could be transferred or that they could buy ships and transfer them to American registry, and they asked us to support such a measure. We did support it, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio, if I am not mistaken, voted for it, and Senator Roor voted for it, and nearly every Republican in Congress voted for that measure, which went promptly upon the statute books. These American shipowners did not want to transfer their ships from a belligerent flag to the American flag because they loved our flag; they transferred them because it saved them from possible capture by hostile cruisers. It may cost them a little more to operate them under the American flag, but they pay this for safety—for insurance.

"When we passed that law we put it in the hands of any American citizen to buy a ship of any belligerent flag and transfer it to American registry. We have given any citizen the power—a power that our opponents now hesitate to give to the President of the United States, who has not a motive on earth except to serve you and to keep this country out of trouble—we have given to any citizen a power that these gentlemen are unwilling to accord to the President of the United States under this shipping bill.

"You know that individuals, for self-interest or for some other reason, may collusively or in bad faith transfer a ship. They may transfer it to our registry for some purpose that is not square, that is not fair, and if they did the American Government has got to come to the front and make diplomatic representations in order to protect the man who does that, because his ship which we permitted to come under American registry flies our flag. We have got to make representations. So far as that transfer is bona fide it is recognized in international law as being a proper transfer. The burden of proof rests upon the man who effectuates that transfer to show in a prize court that it was bona fide. But the Government of the United States would have to intervene through diplomatic channels in each of such cases and see that its citizens and the ships under its flag got justice in that prize court.

"My friends, when the Republicans in Congress and the Democrats in Congress and the Progressives in Congress voted for this ship-registry bill, did they attach any condition to it

that no American citizen or other person should transfer a vessel bearing the flag of a belligerent to American registry, unless we first got the consent of some foreign government? No, sir. And yet in the shipping bill, where we confer upon the President of the United States the power to determine whether any ship bearing a belligerent flag shall be bought, they say they are so afraid that he will do something to involve us in international difficulties that they can not trust him. They would rather surrender the vital American right to protect our own people than to trust the President of the United States, although they are willing to trust an individual.

"I speak with some diffidence about the President of the United States, gentlemen; I speak with diffidence because I have recently had the rare fortune to become a member of his family, and I would not speak of him to-day if it were not well known that the views I now express of him I entertained for years before I ever had any thought that any such great good could come to me. There is no man, if that power is intrusted to him, who will exercise it more wisely, who will exercise it more justly, who will exercise it with greater regard to the rights of every belligerent nation and every neutral nation, who will exercise it with greater fidelity to the interests of the people of this country and to the business men, the farmers, and producers of this country than the President of the United States. Can you trust him? Can you trust him in this shipping bill?

"Gentlemen, there is not an act that this shipping board can commit without the approval of the President of the United States; and more than that, let me say to you that when you talk about limiting or restricting the powers of the President of the United States with a view to preventing him from doing something that might imperil the peace of this country, let me ask you what you mean by conferring upon him the supreme powers of commander in chief of the Army and Navy of this Nation when, without consulting anybody, if he were not wise and prudent and just and honorable and peaceful, he could plunge this country into war in five minutes, and you could not say a word; and yet you hesitate to trust him to buy a few paltry ships for the protection of American commerce. It is not worthy of consideration.

"I want to call your attention to this fact: We all admit the necessity and we admit the opportunity. The report of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of New York admits the necessity and the opportunity. The report of your own chamber admits the necessity and the opportunity—the necessity for dealing with the emergency in the first place, and the opportunity for extending our trade in the second place. To the south of us lies the great southern continent, seeking to establish trade relations with us; seeking to strengthen our social relationship; seeking to extend its financial relationships in this country, and depending absolutely and wholly upon transportation to bring about those great results.

"If we do not give them transportation, gentlemen, what is the use of establishing branch banks in South America and expecting them to compete with English banks or German banks or any other banks? What is the use of our merchants trying to do business in that country if they have not the transportation? They must not only have transportation which will put them upon a parity with other nations in the matter of rates and quality of service, but also in the matter of time, because time is of the very essence of trade and commerce. You can not do business on a freight train when your competitor does it by express. If he does it by express, you have got to use the express or get out of the field. Is that not true? I ask you as business men if that is not true? South America does business with Europe on an express basis, while we do little business on any basis with South America.

"I am afraid I am exceeding my time very much, Mr. President, but I beg your indulgence for a moment or two more. I want to tell you what the ambassador of one of the greatest nations of South America said not long ago in a speech at Boston—Dr. Naon, a most able and distinguished diplomat, and one of the most progressive men from his own great southern continent. He said:

"Let us see, now, what practical method could be adopted for supplying these needs and increasing the amount of our international commerce. There can surely be no better authority in this regard than the official word of the Argentine Government as cabled some days ago to him who has the honor of addressing you at this moment. In this cablegram my Government says in brief:

"Our products are being exported without increased difficulties, but a scarcity of bottoms is foreseen in the near future for the transportation of our products."

"This speech was made last December. He continues:

"A very efficient means of overcoming the difficulty would be if vessels were to come from that country with the usual cargoes, namely, unrefined naphtha, woods, iron, machinery, and other agricultural imple-



ments, petroleum, furniture, lubricating oils, typewriters, machines, etc., these vessels would return with our products, such as refrigerated meats, wool, hides, quebracho, tannin, live stock, etc. American manufacturers could step into the place left by European industries in all branches formerly supplied by them, such as coal (Argentina depends wholly upon the imports of coal), steel rails, galvanized iron, wooden goods, pig and sheet iron, machinery in general, cement, locomotives, railroad cars, refined sugar, automobiles, galvanized iron or steel wire, rail joints, sheet zinc, cotton fabrics, printing paper, electric wire and cables, iron pipe of all kinds, manufactures of iron and steel, household articles, woolen clothing, etc. The present moment offers to manufacturers of such articles most advantageous opportunities for openings, taking advantage of the shutting down of the European markets.

"Then he goes on to speak of the difficulty of securing vessels, and he even goes so far as to say that the Argentine Government itself would be willing to cooperate with this Government in the establishment of suitable steamship lines to take this trade. He goes on to say that there are \$100,000,000 of trade in Argentina seeking American treatment, and yet we are hesitating to do the thing that is necessary to make it possible for us to take it, and not only to take it but to keep it.

"Let me call your attention to the fact that the Panama Railroad & Steamship Line has been operated for 12 years by this Government under the supervision of the War Department. Here is a private corporation engaged in the steamship business and railroad business, the steamships running from the city of New York to the Isthmus, and running at a profit, and as well handled as any steamship company in this country or anywhere else, for that matter. The Panama Railroad & Steamship Co. is a private corporation, of which the Government owns the stock. The Government owns every share of that stock. Its directors are chosen by the Government. It is operated under the supervision of the War Department. The War Department does not make the rates on the Panama steamships. The War Department does not handle the details of operation. It selects a competent board of directors, such as any other private corporation has, and that board of directors selects experts to operate those ships, and they have been successfully operated for 12 years under the supervision of the War Department. We were put into that private steamship business by the Republican Party, and it is to their credit, and I give them credit for it, because it was a necessary and a desirable thing to do, both in the interest of American business and in the interest of the construction of the Panama Canal. The canal has been completed. What are you going to do with those ships? Are you going to give them away? Are you going to require the Panama Railroad Co. by act of the Congress to turn those ships over to the War Department or the Navy Department, to be used solely as reserves, at great expense to this Government, instead of keeping them occupied in trade, as every other intelligent nation does, so that they will not be an expense to the Government, but a profit, and so that we may have them ready for use as naval auxiliaries in time of war? Or are you going to say, 'No; we can not stay in this private business. It offends our every sentiment as the proper agency of government. We are going to get rid of this thing at any cost and get back to our hoary dogma and hug it to death'?

"My friends, where have American intelligence and courage gone? Have they deserted us? I do not believe it. We want to deal with these questions as practical and courageous men. We have to keep that steamship line going. Whether we pass this shipping bill or not, it must continue to be operated in the interest of American commerce throughout Central and South America. The rates of freight have always been reasonable, and I will venture to say that during this period, when extortion has been practiced with a high hand upon American commerce, the Panama Steamship Co. has not raised a single rate an iota of a cent.

"We have been in private business in a great many directions. We have recently passed the Alaskan bill to build a railroad in Alaska. Why did we do that? Because private capital will not develop that great Territory, a Territory whose development is necessary in the interest of the commerce of this great country. We are more justified in going into a Territory for a development of this kind than into a State, because the Territory is the common property of the people of the United States and it is essentially a national function that we should develop it, if we can not get private capital to do it upon reasonable terms.

"You have to make up your minds to one of two things: You either have to let the Government organize this shipping corporation and let it take care of American commerce and protect you, or do nothing to protect the commerce you now have. Recently German submarines have appeared in the English Channel, and even off the coast of Ireland, sinking British merchantmen in which your cargoes are being carried, and that menace is likely to continue longer and grow more dangerous. The only protection to your commerce is to put the American flag upon these ships.

"You have either to adopt this shipping bill or you can do nothing except sit still and submit to robbery and the jeopardy of war. Which will you choose? The Democratic Party can not under its platform adopt any plan involving a subsidy. It is useless to talk about it. You could not get within a thousand miles of a bill that contained a subsidy, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, and as it has power in both branches of Congress, the only alternative is to continue your commerce under foreign flags, subject to all of the incidents and hazards of war, or to adopt this bill.

"Your committee makes a suggestion to the dangers of which I wish to call your attention. They propose that a Federal shipping board be organized; we do it under this bill. They propose that our navigation laws and regulations be altered; the bill provides for that. However, the point of difference is that they propose that the Government shall organize a marine development company in which the Government shall be the sole stockholder, and that this marine development company shall engage in the business of guaranteeing mortgages issued by private corporations; and this same suggestion emanates from the city of New York. My friends, where are we going; whither are we tending? A proposition of that character from the city of New York! The mortgage companies in the city of New York—the private business of guaranteeing the mortgages of corporations or of individuals upon real estate or anything else—you propose to put the Government into competition with, in the most private kind of private business. You also ask us under this plan to have the Government make direct loans to shipping corporations or shipping firms. Do you know what that means? It means that the Government must lend money direct to anybody. There never was a more dangerous experiment or expedient on the face of the earth that could be adopted, and I do not believe any American business man or any intelligent American, if he will study the question for 15 minutes, will stand for it a single second.

"Last fall, when the conditions in the South were so grave and so serious, the price of cotton was down to 5 cents a pound, and a great disaster confronted the southern people. We were asked to sanction the issue of \$250,000,000 of greenbacks or the sale of \$250,000,000 of Government bonds to put that money into the Treasury of this Government and to lend it to farmers upon their cotton. I had to stand against it, although I am from the South—and I hated to do it, gentlemen, so far as the effect was concerned; but I could not, as the representative of this Government, standing on guard at the doors of the Treasury of the United States, advocate any such action. Once you adopt this plan and put the seal and the sanction of the sound business men of America—you sound business men who represent every section of this country—upon a proposition to lend Government money direct to any corporation or any individual, you might as well take the doors down from the National Treasury and involve the entire credit of this Government, because, I tell you, it will be extended everywhere.

"Let me give you an instance of what has happened. In 1837 we had \$38,000,000 surplus in the Federal Treasury. It was during Mr. Van Buren's administration. We were so concerned about that surplus, it was so much money, that there was a great 'row' in Congress to know what to do with it. They did not know what to do with so much money. It became a political question. They finally voted to lend it to the States. You would think that the credit of the States and their obligations to pay were the most reliable assets you could possibly have. I mean, you would think that such obligations were the safest investments you could possibly have. Congress passed a resolution to distribute that money among the States and take back their demand obligations. To-day the Treasury of the United States holds \$28,000,000 of the demand obligations of the richest States in this Union—New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee—every State that was in the Union at that time. We have those demand obligations in the Treasury of the United States to-day, money loaned by this Government to these States. What happened? After we had given them \$28,000,000 a panic struck the land. The act directed that the money be distributed to them in four installments. After the first three had been paid a panic swept the land and the Secretary of the Treasury, the National Treasury being in need of these funds, called upon the different States to pay back, and the representatives of all of these States in Congress passed a resolution, which is on the statute books to-day, preventing the Secretary of the Treasury from collecting these debts until further directed by Congress. The Secretary can not move a peg to collect that money, because they put this inhibition upon the statute books:

"Until further directed by the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury shall not call these loans.



"Yet, gentlemen, when we can not get a State of the American Union to pay its just debts to the Government for money loaned to it, you ask us to stand for a proposition to lend money to private corporations or individuals upon the security of mortgages."

"Never on the face of the earth; and I tell you, gentlemen, if you ever enter upon it, you will have to lend it upon railroads and every other enterprise. Bills are referred to me asking that every conceivable sort of scheme be approved, submitting them for the judgment of the department, for raids upon the United States Treasury in the form of actual loans to be made by the Treasury of the United States on this thing and that thing—farm loans, loans upon houses built by workmen, and so on. They are all entitled to consideration if we are going into the money-lending business. We will have to lend it to everybody. You can not discriminate under our system of government. Everybody must tap the Treasury till if you adopt any such resolution as this."

"There are many things that I wish I could say to you, but I am trenching upon the time of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I want to thank you heartily for the courtesy you have extended to me, and to thank you all for the opportunity you have given me to speak to you, and for the very patient hearing you have accorded me."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD an editorial on "Government-owned merchant ships," appearing in *La Follette's Magazine*, signed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT SHIPS.

The bill for Government-owned ships to aid in carrying our products to foreign markets has been buried under a mass of bitter partisan discussion. This has been cleverly managed by Republican Senators who are hostile to public ownership of any public utility.

One after another they have pounced upon the President and the policies of his administration with a fury calculated to fire party feeling and carry some Republican Senators of progressive tendencies into opposition to the bill as an administration measure.

Hence day after day the bill is ignored, while the tariff and currency, the war tax and business depression, idle mills and idle men, the President's Indianapolis speech, his "hostility to business manifested in legislation," his "surrender to monopoly in naming captains of finance and industry to administer the laws enacted to regulate monopoly"—these have furnished the principal subjects for discussion and for slashing criticism in the long hours of this filibustering debate.

A few statesmen of the archaic type have spoken against the bill. No one listened, and no one will ever read their speeches. For the most part they were the product of another age. It was almost pathetic to witness their efforts as they stolidly toiled through masses of worn-out arguments and obsolete "facts" against Government ownership and operation of public utilities. But at least these "elder statesmen" had the merit of frankness and sincerity in opposing the bill.

But mark the course of their more astute colleagues. I speak now of those distinguished opponents of the bill who with superior skill and cunning spent little time arguing against Government ownership, but with a great show of mingled wisdom and mystery, in throaty and awe-inspiring whispers, admonish us to beware of war! war! war!

It was just before the beginning of the debate on this bill that these same Senators were arraigning the President for his Mexican policy of "watchful waiting." It was stigmatized as puerile and cowardly. The echoes of their censure have scarcely died within our ears. It seems but yesterday that they were denouncing the President because he would not make war on Mexico, to protect the dear property rights of big American business. And to-day these same Senators profess to believe and would have the country believe that back under cover, behind this bill, the President has some dark and sinister plan to force a war with the allies.

If war is lurking anywhere in this proceeding, it must be behind the bill. It is not written in its terms. It can not be found within its four corners.

Ah, but say these suspicious gentlemen, this bill by its terms gives the Government the right to buy vessels as well as to build vessels in which to carry our products to the waiting foreign markets. Now many merchant vessels owned by German companies have taken refuge in our harbors. As Great Britain commands the sea, they can not escape capture were they to venture forth while the war is on. Naturally the German owners desire to sell such vessels.

For 125 years the United States has maintained the doctrine that a citizen of a neutral nation has the right to buy merchant vessels, as he has the right to buy merchandise, of the citizens of any country in time of war as in time of peace; that this is a sovereign right which inheres in every government in conducting its commerce, and, as asserted by Caleb Cushing, Attorney General in 1854, in this we have the support of the authoritative writers on the public law of Europe.

The decisions of our Supreme Court, the opinions of American jurists, and the policy of our Department of State have uniformly sustained this contention. It is an invaluable commercial right, and the administration that surrendered it would be justly denounced as cowardly and un-American.

To maintain this sovereign right on principle is one thing. To wantonly and unnecessarily provoke a controversy regarding it at a time or under conditions which would involve us in serious foreign complications is quite another thing.

Great Britain has always maintained the same view of this sovereign right that our Government has adhered to. But it is now to her interest to take the other side, and she promptly does so. She now asserts that she will contest our right to purchase any interned German merchantmen.

Such a contest, if one were to arise, would go first to an English prize court. If her court were to reverse its former decisions and sus-

tain her foreign office in its new contention, the matter would then become a subject for diplomatic correspondence. If not adjusted by departmental agencies of the two Governments, we would then demand that it be submitted to arbitration, as we have the right to do under our arbitration treaty with Great Britain. It will be seen, therefore, that there is a peaceful and orderly way in which any controversy that might occur would be settled.

It should be stated that Senator Root, of New York, advanced the contention early in this debate that our rights as a neutral to purchase the interned vessels of a belligerent were surrendered by article 56 of the Declaration of London. This declaration is a draft of rules and regulations for the government of an international prize court. It was framed by a convention of delegates representing the participating Governments which assembled in London in 1908. The claim made by Senator Root was shown to be without any foundation whatever by Senator WALSH, whose able argument exposed the entire subject, first, because the convention "was never ratified by Great Britain, and as the ratifications of those powers which indorsed the work of their delegates have never been exchanged, it has not become obligatory as a treaty"; second, the representatives of Great Britain who participated in the London conference, in their report to Lord Grey themselves construed article 56 as "in accord with the rules hitherto enforced by British prize courts." They further stated specifically regarding the transfer of the vessels of belligerents to a neutral that "transfers effected after the outbreak of hostilities are good if made bona fide." Furthermore, Great Britain has issued three proclamations since the beginning of the European war giving notice that she would not be bound by the terms of the London declaration as to many of its important provisions. In this proclamation she has been followed by the allies. As stated by Senator WALSH, "it is accordingly idle to assert that the declaration of London, so contemptuously treated by the allies, can be appealed to by them in justification of any course they may take in the present war, or even that it can justly have any persuasive force in the ultimate determination of our right to purchase the interned ships."

No claim for the London declaration has been advanced since Senator WALSH made his argument.

Our right as a neutral government stands, therefore, as established and maintained in many notable contests. Naturally, President Wilson's administration can not assume the responsibility of surrendering a right which has been sustained by the opinions of our ablest jurists, an unbroken line of decisions by our courts, and the uniform policy of the Department of State declared by such eminent authorities as Secretaries Marcy, Cass, Fish, and Evarts.

Wilson will not plunge this country into war. At the head of a Nation that stands for peace, he has guarded our neutrality with noble care. He has been first to anticipate possible trouble, and quick to speak the word of admonition to avert it. With almost the first clash of the great conflict came his solemn appeal to the people to refrain from any act or utterance which might inflame partisan feelings. Mark his words:

"The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls."

And again, I feel sure it is the earnest wish and purpose of every thoughtful American that this great country of ours, which is, of course, the first in our thoughts and in our hearts, should show herself in this time of peculiar trial a Nation fit beyond others to exhibit the fine poise of undisturbed judgment, the dignity of self-control, the efficiency of dispassionate action; a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own counsel, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world.

This hue and cry about the purchase of German ships plunging us into war with Great Britain lacks sincerity. President Wilson will not, for the saving of a few thousand dollars in the purchase of a ship, hazard the awful cost of war. He will permit nothing to be done that will in any way disturb conditions of neutrality, and it is unnecessary by congressional action to sacrifice our long-established right of a neutral to buy merchantmen or merchandise of a belligerent. It is an insult to propose that President Wilson should give bond to keep the national peace.

These clever opponents of this bill have at heart no fear that the administration will involve us in war with any foreign power. They know better than that. But that the Government will make war upon the Shipping Trust—that is their real fear!

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 4146. An act granting certain lands to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.;

S. 5449. An act to make Pembina, N. Dak., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2518) granting to the town of Nevada, Colo., the right to purchase certain lands for the protection of water supply, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3897) to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5629) for the relief of certain persons who made entry under the provisions of section 6, act of May 29, 1908, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.



The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANGLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANGLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANGLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9591. An act to permit the manufacture of denatured alcohol by mixing domestic and wood alcohol while in process of distillation;

H. R. 12292. An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement;

H. R. 18086. An act to amend section 71 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 4, 1911;

H. R. 18383. An act to provide better sanitary conditions in composing rooms within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 19061. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen under the reclamation projects of the United States;

H. R. 19116. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 20427. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alabama to Walter Dean;

H. R. 20688. An act to place Barrow County, Ga., in the eastern division of the northern district of Georgia;

H. R. 20814. An act to place Candler, Jenkins, and Evans Counties, Ga., in the eastern division of the southern district of Georgia;

H. R. 21200. An act quieting title to a certain tract of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla.;

H. R. 21239. An act to increase the limit of cost of the site of a Federal building at Oakland, Cal.; and

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry-Farming Congress to be held at Denver, Colo., September 27 to October 8, inclusive, 1915.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 17168) to authorize the North Alabama Traction Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Decatur, Ala., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, requesting that the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry be completed and that the officers thereof be transferred to the lineal rank of the United States Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented the petition of Hugh Doherty, of San Jose, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude certain matter from the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the

construction of seven locks and dams on the upper White River in that State, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLAPP presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mankato, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude certain matter from the mail, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of Michael Dowd, of Tacoma; of Mrs. A. L. Weichbrod, of Tacoma; of H. A. Roberts, of Tacoma; of Charles W. Haley, of Tacoma; of J. F. Schwartz, of Puyallup; of Adolf and Agnes Saul, of Puyallup; of Herman F. Eckert, of Auburn; and of sundry other citizens, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pend Oreille County, Wash., praying for the enactment of rural-credit legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Sedgwick Women's Relief Corps, No. 4, Kate Carlin, president, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing pensions for widows who married soldiers of the Civil War after the year 1890, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 7658) for the relief of the estate of Franklin S. Whitney, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 7659) granting a pension to Gideon Mason (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 7660) granting a pension to Edward J. Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for a rifle range for small arms at the navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the publication of the military records of the Revolutionary War, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 18086. An act to amend section 71 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 4, 1911;

H. R. 20688. An act to place Barrow County, Ga., in the eastern division of the northern district of Georgia; and

H. R. 20814. An act to place Candler, Jenkins, and Evans Counties, Ga., in the eastern division of the southern district of Georgia.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 19061. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen under the reclamation projects of the United States;

H. R. 19116. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 20427. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alabama to Walter Dean; and

H. R. 21200. An act quieting title to a certain tract of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla.

H. R. 9591. An act to permit the manufacture of denatured alcohol by mixing domestic and wood alcohol while in process of distillation was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.



H. R. 12292. An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 18383. An act to provide better sanitary conditions in composing rooms within the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 21239. An act to increase the limit of cost of the site of a Federal building at Oakland, Cal., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry-Farming Congress to be held at Denver, Colo., September 27 to October 8, inclusive, 1915, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m., Tuesday, February 16, 1915) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 16, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Bring us, O God, our heavenly Father, as a fitting preparation for the duties of the hour, into oneness with Thee, that we may think right, act right toward Thee and our fellow men, which is salvation. The kingdom of heaven now, with all its uplifting power, removes all doubt, all uncertainties, and makes life sublime.

"Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light."

Hear our prayer and help us to answer it. In the spirit of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 17869) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate has canceled his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 7555) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Suwanee River, in the State of Florida.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday. I think we need the day on appropriation bills. I understand the purpose of the Committee on Rules is to present a rule this morning and dispose of the shipping bill before adjournment to-night, but I think it is necessary to move along with the appropriation bills, and I therefore desire to ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow, and that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow be dispensed with. Is there objection;

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I believe the bill making appropriations to pay pensions is the unfinished business, and would naturally come up to-day unless displaced by order of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. I understand it will be displaced to-day; that is, if a majority is in favor of doing so, which I think is the case.

Mr. MANN. Well, if there is such a rush about appropriation bills, why not take up the pension appropriation bill and pass it to-day? That is a very important bill to the pensioners of the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an important piece of legislation, but the majority has determined to pass another bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the majority is determined to set aside the most important appropriation bill there is, we will have to wait until we see what is done before we dispense with Calendar Wednesday. For the present I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. Does the gentleman from Alabama want his other request put or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. If Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, I do not desire to make the other request.

### PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table three Senate pension bills—S. 6980, S. 7213, and S. 7402—the Senate having disagreed to the House amendments, and asked for a conference. I move that the conferees be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House three Senate pension bills, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to agree to the conference requested by the Senate on these three bills. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANGLEY.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, being in charge of the pension appropriation bill, which would naturally come up this morning as unfinished business, I do not desire to interfere with the purposes of the majority, although it is an important bill and I should like to go on with it in conformity with the general purpose of getting rid of the appropriation bills. But it having been determined in a Democratic caucus last night to consider other business, however much I may agree or disagree with the action on that matter, I do not feel that it would be my duty now to present a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union upon that bill. I want to make this statement in order that it may be known why I do not, being in charge of that bill, now make the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BARTLETT. In one moment; that is, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is ready to present a rule for the consideration of another bill.

Mr. HENRY. I am ready now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the special rule should be offered by the Committee on Rules and the House should not agree to that rule, would the gentleman then move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would. That would be my duty, as the gentleman understands, and I would undertake to carry it out.

Mr. MANN. I understood it, but I would like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows I would, and I would.

### PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 736 (H. Rept. 1410).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on Naval Affairs shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 5259 and the House shall proceed immediately to the consideration of same. There shall be not exceeding six hours' general debate on the bill, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE]. That it shall be in order to offer the following amendments only, which may be offered during the general debate and considered as pending, to wit: Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "with the approval of the President"; in line 5, page 2, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to"; at the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm



or individual, citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual party to such charter or lease shall violate the provisions of the same.

"The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901.

"The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders, shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

"The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

"Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

"Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

"Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

"The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

"The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

"Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

"At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

"Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

"Sec. 6. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed \$10,000,000, neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

"Sec. 7. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from the proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board: *And provided further*, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.

"Sec. 8. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall not issue any bonds in excess of \$40,000,000, or incur any liabilities other than stock issues in excess of \$10,000,000. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board; and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities

governing merchant vessels in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

"All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States heretofore made or published by authority of law shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall, as provided hereby, take the place of those now in existence.

"The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States, in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character, as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect, in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

"Sec. 9. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutula: *Provided*, That the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States, except as herein provided.

"Sec. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be \$6,000 per annum.

"Sec. 11. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

"Sec. 12. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use, and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace; and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace; and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided, upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

"Sec. 13. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily for use as naval auxiliaries of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

"Sec. 14. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

"Sec. 15. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of \$10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 7, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

"Sec. 16. That two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels.

"That the Secretary of the Navy shall in such leases provide for their cancellation whenever such vessels may be required for naval or military purposes.

"That all leases made under this section of the act shall be subject to all of the provisions of section 5 of this act relating to maximum rates and charges and terms and conditions of forfeiture.

"That when the vessels, land, piers, leases for land or piers, and other property held by the corporation are disposed of as herein provided the corporation herein provided for shall be dissolved and said shipping board abolished.

"Sec. 17. That sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not take effect until two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President."

At the conclusion of the general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the amendment and the bill and vote shall be had upon the final passage of the bill without other intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.



Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I am entitled to an hour.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Before the debate begins, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice the last paragraph of the rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the "amendment," while the first paragraph of the rule provides for offering certain "amendments."

Mr. HENRY. It should be "amendments" in the last paragraph. I will ask that the letter "s" be added to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to amend by adding the letter "s."

Mr. HENRY. It is a typographical error.

Mr. MANN. In line 6, page 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to inquire whether the Speaker in construing this rule will hold that the bill is to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it so states somewhere in the rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. HENRY. I suggest that the construction of the rule will come up after it is adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course I do not want—

The SPEAKER. It is perfectly proper for the gentleman to make the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENRY. The rule reads that—

The House shall proceed to consider.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am perfectly willing to pretermitt the question.

The SPEAKER. Where is that provision?

Mr. HENRY. In line 3 of the first section.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion from the verbiage of this rule that it would be considered in the ordinary way.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I was going to suggest.

The SPEAKER. That is, that the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the reason I ask the question, because unless otherwise specifically provided for the rules of the House require that all bills making appropriations shall be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and it is to be presumed that if the committee intended that the bill should be considered in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union they would have so stated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is entirely correct about that.

Mr. HENRY. Of course I have no objection to it being modified to that extent.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman wishes to ask for that modification, he can do so; and if he does not want to do so, he does not have to.

Mr. HENRY. It makes no difference. I suppose gentlemen on the other side do not desire more than 20 minutes on this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Texas is mistaken. We would like to have a little more time than that.

Mr. HENRY. How much time would you like?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I really have requests for much more time than I have the face to ask for.

Mr. HENRY. I think the rule is so liberal that you should not ask much.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think we can get on with an hour on this side.

Mr. HENRY. I think 30 minutes on a side ought to be an abundance of time, and I suggest, if the gentleman is willing to take 30 minutes, that I will yield him 30 minutes of my hour; and I suggest that we agree that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman move the previous question at the end of the hour?

Mr. HENRY. I hardly think it is necessary to do that. I think the gentleman might agree that we should order the previous question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It will be impossible to secure unanimous consent to have the previous question ordered.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman to have an abundance of time; but it seems to me that 30 minutes on a side are sufficient. This matter has been thoroughly discussed.

Mr. MADDEN. Where?

Mr. HENRY. In various quarters.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The 30 minutes will be satisfactory, but I shall ask that the gentleman move the previous question at the close of the debate.

Mr. HENRY. I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered at the end of one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that at the end of one hour's debate on this rule the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I will object.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 126, answered "present" 4, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 65.]

YEAS—181.

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Igoe	Reilly, Conn.
Adair	Doremus	Jacoway	Reilly, Wis.
Adamson	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Rothermel
Alexander	Dupré	Johnson, S. C.	Rouse
Allen	Eagle	Keating	Ruby
Ashbrook	Estopinal	Kennedy, Conn.	Rucker
Aswell	Evans	Kirkpatrick	Russell
Bailey	Fergusson	Kitchin	Seldomridge
Baker	Ferris	Konop	Sherley
Baltz	Fields	Korbly	Sherwood
Barkley	FitzHenry	Lafferty	Sims
Beakes	Flood, Va.	Lazaro	Small
Bell, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Blackmon	Foster	Leshner	Smith, Tex.
Booher	Fowler	Lever	Stedman
Borland	Gallagher	Levy	Stephens, Miss.
Brodbeck	Garner	Lewis, Md.	Stephens, Nebr.
Brown, N. Y.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Bryan	Garrett, Tex.	Linthicum	Stone
Buchanan, Ill.	Gilmore	Lloyd	Stout
Bulkley	Glass	Lobeck	Stringer
Burke, Wis.	Goeke	Lomergan	Summers
Burnett	Goldfogle	McAndrews	Taggart
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKellar	Taylor, Ala.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goulden	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Ark.
Candler, Miss.	Graham, Ill.	Metz	Taylor, Colo.
Caraway	Gray	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Casey	Gregg	Moon	Thomas
Church	Griffin	Mulkey	Townsend
Clancy	Gudger	Murray	Tribble
Clark, Fla.	Hamlin	Neeley, Kans.	Underwood
Claypool	Hardy	Neely, W. Va.	Vaughan
Cline	Harris	Oldfield	Vinson
Coady	Harrison	Padgett	Vollmer
Collier	Hay	Page, N. C.	Walsh
Connelly, Kans.	Hayden	Palmer	Watkins
Cox	Heflin	Park	Watson
Crisp	Helm	Peterson	Weaver
Crosser	Helvering	Phelan	Webb
Cullopp	Henry	Post	Whitacre
Davenport	Holland	Pou	Williams
Decker	Houston	Quin	Wingo
Dershem	Howard	Rainey	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Raker	
Dixon	Hull	Rauch	
Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rayburn	

NAYS—126.

Anderson	Gallivan	La Follette	Porter
Anthony	Gardner	Langham	Powers
Austin	Gerry	Langley	Prouty
Barchfeld	Gillett	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Barton	Good	Lindbergh	Rogers
Bathrick	Gordon	Lindquist	Scott
Bell, Cal.	Green, Iowa	McGuire, Okla.	Sells
Borchers	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Shackleford
Britten	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Sinnot
Brockson	Guernsey	MacDonald	Sisson
Broussard	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Slemp
Browne, Wis.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Sloan
Browning	Haugen	Mapes	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hawley	Martin	Smith, Minn.
Butler	Helgesen	Miller	Smith, Saml. W.
Callaway	Hinds	Mondell	Stafford
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Moore	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Morgan, Okla.	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Morrison	Stevens, Minn.
Cranton	Hulings	Moss, Ind.	Stevens, N. H.
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.	Sutherland
Davis	Johnson, Utah	Mott	Switzer
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Murdock	Temple
Donohoe	Keister	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Norton	Towner
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Volstead
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, N. J.	Walters
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Fess	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Kinkaid	Platt	
French	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley	



ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.			
Bartlett	Beall, Tex.	Dies	Logue
NOT VOTING—112.			
Aiken	Dooling	Kahn	Rupley
Alney	Driscoll	Kettner	Sabath
Avis	Drukker	Key, Ohio	Saunders
Barnhart	Dunn	Kiess, Pa.	Scully
Bartholdt	Eagan	Kreider	Shreve
Bowdle	Edwards	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Brown, W. Va.	Elder	L'Engle	Smith, Idaho
Bruckner	Falson	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	Falconer	Loft	Sparkman
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	McClellan	Stanley
Burgess	Fitzgerald	McGillicuddy	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Francis	Mahan	Talbot, N. Y.
Calder	Gard	Maher	Tavener
Cantor	George	Manahan	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gill	Montague	Thacher
Carew	Gittins	Morgan, La.	Thompson, Okla.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Morin	Treadway
Carr	Gorman	Nolan, J. I.	Tuttle
Carter	Graham, Pa.	O'Brien	Underhill
Cary	Griest	Oglesby	Vare
Connolly, Iowa	Hamill	O'Hair	Walker
Conry	Hart	O'Shaunessy	Wallin
Copley	Hayes	Patten, N. Y.	Whaley
Dale	Hensley	Price	White
Danforth	Hill	Ragsdale	Wilson, Fla.
Deitrick	Hobson	Reed	Wilson, N. Y.
Dent	Hoxworth	Riordan	Winslow
Difenderfer	Jones	Roberts, Nev.	Woodruff

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. MCGILICUDDY with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. DALE with Mr. CONRY.

Mr. DENT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. THACHER with Mr. VARE.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. WALLIN.

On this vote:

Mr. SCULLY (for previous question) with Mr. J. I. NOLAN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for previous question) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for previous question) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for previous question) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for previous question) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. STANLEY (for previous question) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for previous question) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. UNDERHILL (for previous question) with Mr. HAYES (against).

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. FALCONER. No, sir; I was at the telephone booth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. GILL. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas. No, sir; I was in the cloak-room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I can say at the present time more than is contained in the rule. I think we all understand the rule. Its language is as plain as it can be, and we understand the object of it. There is no need of my taking up the time of the House, and therefore I shall for the present yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW].

Mr. POW. Mr. Speaker, next year is election year. It has been quite noticeable of late that the nearer we approach the coming election the greater becomes the abuse of the President. He is denounced by partisan press as only a criminal ought to be denounced. What has he done? Has he deserved all this partisan abuse? Has he deserved any of it? Let us see. He has urged the passage of several great reform measures. He urged tariff revision. He urged currency reform. He urged the measure defining more clearly our antitrust laws. He urged the trade-commission bill. All of these great measures have now become the law of the land.

There is one significant fact about the passage of these bills which should not be forgotten. While there is a large Democratic majority in this Chamber and a working majority in the other Chamber, all of the measures which the President has recommended would have passed both bodies if we had had no majority at all.

If our membership in this Chamber had been just half instead of two to one, we would nevertheless have passed all of the measures President Wilson has urged. Yet he is denounced as a dictator and political tyrant by the Republican press, and we who vote for these administration measures are called automations who sit here with no views or convictions of our own, simply carrying out the wishes of the President.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, in this day and time a man to be independent, to be credited with having convictions of his own, must vote against the President. No matter what your convictions are, if you vote with the President you are merely obeying orders. To be an independent American Representative, you must be against the President.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something more than the presidential will behind these measures. I can understand how his influence might affect a Democrat, but I can not understand why so many Republicans and Progressives support these measures unless there is real merit in them, and on every occasion we have received sufficient Republican or Progressive votes to pass every one of the measures if the two Chambers had been equally divided between two parties.

Mr. Speaker, we will hear the caucus held last night denounced. Why? We stood by the President.

The enemies of the President hoped we would break up in a row. If we had done that, our popularity among the President's enemies would have been great indeed. Oh, what splendid men we would have been if we had repudiated the President! For my part I do not want that kind of popularity. God knows if I thought the President was wrong I would not go with him. The trouble with me is I can not help thinking he is right upon these measures, and if I did not go with him under those circumstances I would not be fit to sit in this Chamber.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to what extent men will go to win a party victory.

Here is this man in the White House working, striving, for what—for some special interest? Oh, no; not that. There is not a political enemy of the President in this Chamber who will rise in his seat now and say that he believes any but the purest motives prompt Mr. Wilson in all he has done or is trying to do.

What will be the fate of this bill? Why is it Mr. Wilson wants us to pass it? Freight rates are prohibitively high and cargoes of American goods, the products of our farms and factories, await shipment. Those cargoes will not be sent abroad at all if this bill does not pass unless somebody pays a tremendous freight rate. The President says there is a very practical remedy—the passage of this bill. For my part I am proud of the chance to help, and I do not care the snap of my finger what anybody says. I believe the President is right, and when I vote with him I believe I am doing what is best for the American people.

The President has at his disposal the great army of Government patronage. Nobody has charged that he has offered to punish any man who has differed from him. He could use the patronage ax. It has been used, but that is not the Wilson way of doing things. He has influence which extends beyond his own party. He carries not only his own party but part of both the other parties, and he does it without threat of any kind.

It must be he is right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the secret of the President's success. He is trying to serve



the American people. And when the record of his administration is made up, thank God, it will not be passed upon by any partisan jury, but by free American voters.

Republicans who are willing to be unfair may talk about our secret caucus; you may denounce the President because he is not of your party; you may criticize your colleagues in this Chamber because we will not break with the President; but, after all, these measures will be passed upon by the jury of American voters, and the President and those who stand with him with perfect confidence await their verdict. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, this rule will be adopted by this House, although a majority of the membership of this House is against the rule. The bill to which the rule relates will be passed by this House before we adjourn to-night, although a majority of the membership of the House is against the bill. I make that deliberate statement, that if the majority of this House were free to record their convictions upon the merits of the bill, it would be defeated before we adjourn to-night. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] has just said that we will denounce the caucus and denounce this bill as the work of a secret caucus. You will hear no one on this side of the aisle denouncing this bill as the work of a secret caucus. You held a caucus last night, but you made only one slight amendment to the bill. This bill was not the work of a secret caucus, it was not the work of any committee of this House, it was not the work of the membership of this House. This bill, sir, is the product of the President of the United States [applause and cheers on the Democratic side], and your caucus was not held for the purpose of considering this bill, but to carry out the orders of the captain of your team. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when you will understand that whenever the captain of a team undertakes to order every move that shall be made by the members of the team, at the end of the season that team will always find itself the tail-end of the league. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

What is this proposition? A rule comes in this morning to discharge a committee that has never considered the bill and make that bill in order. The Committee on Rules undertakes further to attach as an amendment a proposition that has never been introduced in the House of Representatives. They have attached a proposition to the bill that has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, but which has never been considered by any committee in that body. Oh, you ought to be proud of your method of legislating.

The Washington Herald this morning undertakes to quote from a speech that the distinguished Speaker of this House made to the caucus last night. Mr. Speaker, you are reported as saying:

The President wants this bill—

And that is all you are considering—

The President wants this bill, and it is probably as good a bill as could be framed, even if we delayed matters. I am opposed to Government ownership, but this is an emergency measure. The House should do everything possible to expedite action and avoid an extra session. If there is an extra session the Democratic Party will be wiped off the face of the earth at the next election.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

For your judgment, sir, as to the result of an extra session, I have the profoundest respect. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the great complaint that our opponents have against this Congress and this administration has been that it has not shown the lack of efficiency that they predicted it would show, and for some reason or other they are utterly unable to get over that particular complaint. If the Democratic Party had shown the lack of efficiency and the lack of power to grasp the great public questions and emergencies of this administration, they would have denounced it with the time-honored and threadbare denunciation that they have used on the stump. But the fact that the Democratic majority in this House can work in harmony with the Democratic President and a Democratic administration to accomplish the great economic good of the American people seems to sit pretty ill upon their stomachs.

No attempt has been made to jam this bill through this House, and no attempt will be made to jam this bill through

this Congress. [Laughter on the Republican side.] This bill has been carefully considered [laughter on the Republican side]—yes; this bill has been given as careful consideration as any measure before the American Congress. It has attracted as widespread public attention, it has been debated by as many experts and as much light has been thrown on this economic measure as upon any measure that ever came before Congress, and it is simple in its characteristics. Except for the question of detail, the question is purely and simply whether the Government will establish the mercantile marine in the face of an emergency in this country. All else is a matter of machinery and detail.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Does not the bill provide that within two years after the cessation of the European war these ships shall all be disposed of, and we shall go out of the business entirely?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be explained by gentlemen who are more familiar with it than I, but I can say in the limited time that I have that the bill provides in effect that for two years the shipping board shall buy and acquire ships, charter and lease them under the shipping board, and at the end of two years after the cessation of the European war the ships shall be turned over to the permanent operating agency, which is the Navy Department itself. In brief, that is the bill. The ship board itself is a temporary matter, coming to an end altogether by proclamation of the President two years after the end of the European war. At that time these ships become auxiliaries of the Navy and are turned over to the Secretary of the Navy. The proposition is simple, and the American people are asking action on this matter. It has been debated now week after week, and practically month after month, while the business conditions in the country are waiting. Now, through the efficiency and team work and harmony of the Democratic caucus and of the Democratic administration this bill comes before this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be notified at the end of three minutes and to yield the two remaining minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] talks of efficiency of the party in power. Efficiency which depends on despotism and which takes all power from the majority of the membership of this House is not the kind of efficiency to be commended in a representative body. There is something just as important as efficiency, and that is liberty. I want to call attention to the quadruple gag in this resolution. Here are united four separate ways of gagging this House through the Committee on Rules. We may forget the caucus of last night and simply put our attention to the power of the Committee on Rules of the House. First, here is the discharge of a committee. The rules provide for the discharge of committees. Under the rules we have a system supposed to furnish a method for discharging a committee from consideration of a measure after a due time has elapsed. On the first day possible in this term, December 1, 1913, a resolution was introduced to discharge a committee under the rule. That motion and all others like it have never been considered in the Sixty-third Congress and never will be. During the entire two years of this Congress no motion to discharge a committee has been considered, yet the Rules Committee come in here and offers a rule to discharge the Committee on Naval Affairs from consideration of a bill, thus doing what a majority of this House has never been able to accomplish. Second, this rule limits debate to six hours on a proposition that the Senate has been considering for many weeks and which has never been considered by the House. Third, it forces an arbitrary rule on the House by which no amendment can be made to the measure. Fourth, it is the enactment of new legislation that has never been considered by a committee or by this House. The rule takes the four sections of the Weeks bill, but in the last provision provides that these four sections shall not go into effect until two years after the European war is over. These are the ways in which this rule proves that the majority of the membership is absolutely lacking in power and efficiency under customary methods of procedure. I want to support this measure, because I am in favor of the principle involved. I believe in the principle and policy of Government ownership of steamships, but these methods of dictating consideration are unjustifiable and can not be successfully defended any more than they have been by the chair-



man of the Committee on Rules, Mr. HENRY, and the others who have spoken here. These men are silent on the vital issues of legislative procedure in this rule, for such methods can not be defended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But if I were against it, I would have a better reason for being against it than the fact that the President of the United States is for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The opposition to the bill is largely partisan. I have seen the time in this body when if the Republican organization had proposed such a bill it would have had practically the unanimous Republican support. So much for the partisan side of this discussion. Now as to the proposed rule. As usual, whenever the House and the Senate have entangling parliamentary difficulties with a measure, the House is made the goat. Because there is no cloture rule whatever in the Senate, we must have complete cloture over here. Why should we be made to suffer for the sins of the Senate? Why should you Democrats gag us? Why should the majority here, when you have the President and are in complete control of both branches of the National Legislature—why should you apply the gag? Now, I am not shedding any crocodile tears over this procedure with the weeping Republicans. I have seen practically the same thing here before under Republican rule and in connection with shipping legislation. On January 14, 1907—if some of the Democratic chieftains care to do so they can hunt it up—a ship-subsidy bill, under the direction of the then Republican organization, was rammed through the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in one day. It had been introduced by a new member of the committee, appointed to the committee for that purpose, apparently. There had been no previous regular meeting of that committee upon that bill. There had been for weeks previous, however, private dinner parties, at which the bill was considered, under direction of the Republican leaders. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So this is no new procedure. It is an old one. But why continue it? Now, Mr. Speaker, as to this measure, if I did not believe that there was included in it a plain proposition that we shall observe complete neutrality in the taking over of vessels [laughter on the Republican side]—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I have read it over and over again.

A MEMBER. When?

Mr. MURDOCK. And, besides my satisfaction with the plain language of the provisions, I have in my mind what the Republicans could not have if they tried—full confidence in the President of the United States in reading those words as they are. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I wish the Democrats in this House would applaud more and gag less. I shall vote for the bill. The measure merits support, but it does not warrant the gag which accompanies its presentation here to-day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas to use some time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many speeches has the gentleman?

Mr. HENRY. Just one.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, this gag rule purposes to make in order the latest scheme of the President for reviving prostrate industry in the United States.

The President's appeals for the passage of his ship-purchase bill would be more convincing if any one of the other schemes he has proposed, one after another, had made good his promise that they would revive languishing industries throughout the country. What the country needs is more buying and selling at home, more confidence, more business among our own people; but nothing is proposed that will bring this condition.

And this bill is urged when it is doubtful if anyone believes it will become a law in this Congress. It is equally certain that few believe it should become a law at all, and a less number believe it would do any good if it does. It is safe to say that less than one-third of the American people or of the Members of this Congress believe in either the principle the bill involves or in the wisdom of its enactment into law. This gag rule purposes to force through the House, with whip and spur, the White House bill, with only a secret caucus indorsement. The bill in its present form has not even had the consideration of a committee at either end of the Capitol, and has had scant, if any, consideration at the Legislative Mansion, if I may borrow from the gentleman from Wyoming.

This bill launches the Government into the business of carrying private property for the private gain of a very few people. It put all of the people, by Government action, into competition

with those of our people who are common carriers upon the sea. The President says the scheme will revive our languishing industries. The President has been just as sure that each of the five other schemes he has purposed, one after another, would do the same thing.

The purchase of foreign ships belonging to belligerents now interned in our ports, as proposed, would launch the Government upon a dangerous and most expensive experiment. Even if there were no danger that with the purchase of belligerent ships we should become involved in a foreign war, there is still no justification for the passage of this bill.

The Government must purchase ships, the President says, to afford facilities for exporting American products. There may have been a few days, after the beginning of the war in Europe, when our commerce, outward and inward, languished, but that condition has long since passed.

Since the beginning of the war our exports have increased far beyond our normal outward commerce. The official reports, up to the 1st of January, 1915, show we have exported since the war began over \$9,000,000 worth of automobiles, \$41,000,000 worth of steel products, \$8,500,000 worth of woolen goods, \$33,000,000 worth of leather products, and \$17,000,000 worth of sugar. In the month of last December alone we exported 29,000,000 bushels of wheat, five times the amount exported in December of the year before, at the average price of \$1.25 per bushel, while in December of the year 1913 the average price was 98 cents per bushel. In last December we exported \$9,500,000 worth of flour, more than twice as much as in December, 1913. In December, 1914, we exported 5,250,000 bushels of oats, as against 30,000 bushels in December, 1913. The exports of oats in the month of December, 1914, was greater than for the entire year of 1913.

We exported in December, 1914, 4,500,000 bushels of corn, valued at \$3,500,000, as against 749,000 bushels, valued at \$560,000, in December, 1913. In December, 1914, we exported 6,500,000 pounds of fresh beef, as against 524,000 pounds in December, 1913. We exported as much fresh beef in December, 1914, as in the entire year of 1913. We have exported over \$200,000,000 worth of breadstuffs since the war in Europe began. We have exported over \$8,000,000 worth of horses. Last week cotton exports were 365,733 bales, a greater number of bales, it is claimed, than in any week last year; and the total exports of cotton for the year now totals almost 4,500,000 bales.

Mr. Speaker, all this vast outward commerce has brought better prices to the American producer, except cotton, than he has received for similar products under normal conditions of export in recent years.

But the President says that the cost of over-sea transportation is abnormal. The conditions of over-sea transportation are abnormal. Search and possible seizure, mines, war zones, congested foreign ports, difficulty in unloading in foreign ports, returning with light loads—all these abnormal conditions account for the abnormal increase in ocean freight rates and for whatever temporary difficulty cargoes find in leaving American ports.

From whom and from where does the demand come for this legislation? Certainly not from the farmers and manufacturers of the United States, for they are exporting in larger quantities than in the normal years of peace, and at better prices; and it follows that they have found sufficient facilities for carrying their larger exports, while the President and two members of his Cabinet have been taxing their own energies and the patience of the American people in an endeavor to secure the passage of this bill.

Why, the President within three days has received, if press reports are to be credited, from the mayor of New York an appeal to place an embargo on wheat, one of the chief products of the American farmer, and the reason for urging the embargo is that we have so enormously increased our wheat exports within the last few months that we have endangered the food supply of our own people.

The suggestion of an embargo on wheat has been made from many points in the eastern portion of the United States, while from the West there come demands to every Member of the Congress for an embargo on munitions of war, products of manufacture. Demands from every portion of our country come for an embargo on exports, and the answer of the administration is a proposition to embark the Government as a common carrier upon the seas of additional export products.

While the President has been taking his time and the time of the Congress in urging the purchase of five or six ships of commerce our increased exports have stimulated American shipbuilding, and private enterprise is now employed in building American ships for use in the common paths of the sea to the ports of the world with the export products of the American



people. There is an unprecedented boom in shipbuilding in the shipyards of the United States. All along the Atlantic seaboard shipyards are busy. Newport News, the Maryland Steel Co., the New York Shipbuilding Co., the Fall River Shipbuilding Co. are all working to the limit of their capacity filling orders for ships. To-day there is under construction at Newport News two 15,000-ton steel vessels and two 10,000-ton steel freighters.

Is it the purpose of the Government to stop this one demand for American labor by the purchase of interned ships of belligerents now in American ports? There are 66 of these now in the ports of our country—55 German ships and 11 Austrian ships. Private citizens do not buy these, because of the diplomatic and international questions involved and the danger of involving our country in the deplorable war now waging in Europe. The administration should profit by the example of American citizens and refrain from an act that may involve this country in foreign complications that may at any time result in war.

In the meantime the promises of the Baltimore platform and of the President for rural-credit legislation and to reduce the cost of living are unkept. Nothing is done for conservation, and the appeals of Porto Rico for better government are unheeded. We approach the last days of this Congress, and only one of the great supply bills for the Government has become a law, and the President insists on consuming all the time on another experiment not promised by him or his platform.

Why does the President insist on this Congress, that has been so nearly repudiated, spending its last days passing on this important measure? Does he fear to submit his new proposal for Government competition with private enterprise in our overseas commerce to Representatives lately chosen by the people?

The President requires a platform pledge from his party as a basis of his support for woman suffrage and for limiting foreign immigration. He has neither a platform pledge nor a favorable expression from the people for this proposal. Indeed, he seems to fear to submit this measure to the latest Representatives chosen by the American people, and insists upon this consideration by a Congress that has been all but repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to both the rule and the bill. I would avoid war by not provoking it. I would not purchase a quarrel by purchasing ships of belligerents in violation of the principles of international law to which we have subscribed. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] said that he had noticed where a baseball team started in by following every order of the captain they usually came out at the tail end when the season closed. Evidently the gentleman is a novice in the baseball business. I have seen a few baseball games myself, and my observation has been that where a team starts in by not following the orders of the captain at the beginning of the season they begin at the tail end and end there.

Mr. Speaker, we are following the lead of our captain, and you gentlemen will find that the American people follow his lead when he is this day undertaking to rescue them from the shipping pirates of the high seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Their attention is fixed on this body, and they know what is going on. The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MURDOCK, made a very sensible speech. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The only regret I have is that he did not commence making sensible speeches at the beginning of his career. Now, Mr. Speaker, the other gentleman from Kansas, Mr. CAMPBELL—and I presume I will not be accused of saying anything offensive when I refer to him as a "standpat Republican"—speaks of this "gag rule" that we are passing to-day. Let me say to him that the people, the voters, everywhere will justify this "gag rule" rescuing them from the monopoly of the Shipping Trust and the oppression that has been going on for more than a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more than that, Mr. Speaker, when the contest comes in this country, when the session of Congress is ended, when we appeal to the American people under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, and the people hear the voice of that other tribune of their rights, the Speaker of this House, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK [applause on the Democratic side], than whom no man here is better loved, and hear the voice of that other leader who goes to the other end of this Capitol, the Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, in support of the Wilson administration, they will record a verdict justifying our action.

Gentlemen, we welcome this contest. It is a struggle between this administration and the Shipping Trust. He is grappling with the shipping monopoly before the gaze of the world. The

Shipping Trust is going to destroy Wilson's administration or Wilson will destroy the Shipping Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe when the contest is over the Shipping Trust will fall. It will not be the Democratic administration fighting in behalf of the American people. Ah, gentlemen talk about Government ownership and this Government embarking in commercial enterprises! Do you not recall that in the very beginning of this Government we embarked in Government ownership and constructed highways leading from one part of this continent to the other—among them the Cumberland Road—in order that the commerce of the people might be carried over them? Under Jefferson, Jackson, Madison, and Monroe we constructed these highways for the benefit of the people, so they might interchange their commerce. And then the war came on and this Government again embarked in Government ownership and aided in the construction of the great transcontinental railways, and the people applauded and justified that governmental enterprise. And when we came to the Panama Canal, under Roosevelt again we embarked in Government ownership, and are now making a success of that enterprise. And recently we passed the Alaskan railroad bill. And if you call that Government ownership, all well and good. It will justify itself, and if it takes Government ownership, if this Government must go into a commercial enterprise, to destroy the shipping monopoly and trust on the high seas, I am ready to follow the leader and cast my vote in favor of it. What do you gentlemen propose? You propose a subsidy, to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers and put in the pockets of this monopoly, and at the end of that time the people will have no relief.

We propose something that is sound, that is sane, that will justify itself, and that will bring the relief we have promised the American people; and let me say that when this fight has been finished, after Woodrow Wilson has presented his record to the voters and you have taken the other side of the issue, in 1916 he will triumph, because he is fighting for the people's cause, and you are on the side of the special privileged class.

We welcome the conflict. Call on the battle. Shall the shipping pirates of the high seas win or the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson go down in loss of confidence and support? For my part, I will be standing by Wilson's side in this last death struggle against the world's greatest and most conscienceless monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those who favor the resolution will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 139, answered "present" 2, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 66.]

YEAS—186.

Abercrombie	Coady	Gittins	Kirkpatrick
Adair	Collier	Glass	Konop
Adamson	Connelly, Kans.	Goeke	Korbly
Alken	Connolly, Iowa	Goldfogle	Lafferty
Alexander	Cox	Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro
Allen	Crisp	Goulden	Lee, Pa.
Ashbrook	Crosser	Gray	Leshner
Aswell	Cullopp	Gregg	Lever
Bailey	Decker	Griffin	Levy
Baker	Dershem	Gudger	Lewis, Md.
Baltz	Dickinson	Hamlin	Lieb
Barkley	Dixon	Hardy	Linthicum
Beakes	Donovan	Harris	Lloyd
Bell, Ga.	Doolittle	Harrison	Lobeck
Booher	Doremus	Hay	Loneragan
Borland	Doughton	Hayden	McAndrews
Bowdle	Driscoll	Heflin	McKellar
Brodbeck	Dupré	Helm	Maguire, Nebr.
Brown, N. Y.	Eagan	Helvering	Metz
Brumbaugh	Eagle	Henry	Mitchell
Bryan	Evans	Hensley	Moon
Buchanan, Ill.	Ferguson	Hill	Neeley, Kans.
Buchanan, Tex.	Ferris	Holland	Neely, W. Va.
Bulkley	Fields	Houston	O'Hair
Burke, Wis.	FitzHenry	Howard	Oldfield
Burnett	Flood, Va.	Hoxworth	Padgett
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer
Byrns, Tenn.	Foster	Hull	Park
Candler, Miss.	Fowler	Humphreys, Miss.	Peterson
Caraway	Francis	Igoe	Post
Casey	Gallagher	Jacoway	Pou
Church	Garner	Johnson, Ky.	Quin
Clancy	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, S. C.	Rainey
Clark, Fla.	Garrett, Tex.	Keating	Raker
Claypool	Gill	Kennedy, Conn.	Rauch
Cline	Gillmore	Key, Ohio	Rayburn



Reilly, Conn.	Small	Taggart	Vollmer
Reilly, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.	Talcott, N. Y.	Walsh
Rothermel	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ark.	Watkins
Rouse	Stedman	Taylor, Colo.	Watson
Rubey	Stephens, Miss.	Ten Eyck	Weaver
Rucker	Stephens, Nebr.	Thomas	Webb
Russell	Stephens, Tex.	Townsend	Williams
Seldomridge	Stone	Tribble	Wingo
Sherley	Stout	Underwood	Young, Tex.
Sherwood	Stringer	Vaughan	
Sims	Summers	Vinson	

## NAYS—139.

Anderson	Fordney	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley
Anthony	Frear	La Follette	Porter
Austin	French	Langham	Powers
Barchfield	Gallivan	Langley	Roberts, Mass.
Bartlett	Gardner	Lenroot	Rogers
Barton	Gerry	Lindbergh	Scott
Bathrick	Gillett	Lindquist	Sells
Bell, Cal.	Good	McKenzie	Shackleford
Borchers	Gordon	McLaughlin	Sinnott
Britten	Green, Iowa	MacDonald	Sisson
Brockson	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Slayden
Broussard	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Slemp
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Mapes	Sloan
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Haugen	Mondell	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Hawley	Montague	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Helgesen	Moore	Stafford
Chandler, N. Y.	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Steenerson
Cooper	Hinebaugh	Morrison	Stevens, Cal.
Cramton	Howell	Moss, Ind.	Stevens, Minn.
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	Moss, W. Va.	Stevens, N. H.
Davenport	Hullings	Mott	Sutherland
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Murdock	Switzer
Deltrick	Johnson, Utah	Murray	Temple
Dies	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Dillon	Jones	Norton	Towner
Donohoe	Kelster	Page, N. C.	Voistead
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Paige, Mass.	Walters
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, N. J.	Whitacre
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, N. Y.	White
Falconer	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Farr	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fess	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Fitzgerald	Kinkaid	Platt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.  
Beall, Tex. Logue

## NOT VOTING—96.

Ainey	Drukker	L'Engle	Sabath
Avis	Dunn	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Barnhart	Edwards	Loft	Scully
Bartholdt	Elder	McClellan	Shreve
Blackmon	Estopinal	McGillcuddy	Smith, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Falson	McGuire, Okla.	Sparkman
Bruckner	Finley	Mahan	Stanley
Burgess	Gard	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	George	Manahan	Tavener
Calder	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Cantor	Gorman	Morin	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Mulkey	Thacher
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson, Okla.
Carlin	Griest	O'Brien	Treadway
Carr	Hamill	Oglesby	Tuttle
Carter	Hart	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cary	Hayes	Phelan	Vare
Conry	Hobson	Price	Walker
Copley	Kahn	Prouty	Wallin
Dale	Kettner	Ragsdale	Whaley
Danforth	Kiess, Pa.	Reed	Wilson, Fla.
Dent	Kitchin	Riordan	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Kreider	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Doolling	Lee, Ga.	Rupley	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. UNDERHILL (for) with Mr. HAYES (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. STANLEY (for) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois (for) with Mr. BARTHOLDT (against).

Mr. LEE of Georgia (for) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. WALLIN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. HART with Mr. MANAHAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the rule and those who may speak on the bill may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the rule and those who speak on the bill may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Chair wishes to correct a ruling. When the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] made a parliamentary inquiry this morning the Chair read only the first sentence of this rule:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on Naval Affairs shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 5259 and the House shall proceed immediately to the consideration of same.

The Chair is still of the opinion that if that was all there was to it the House would go into Committee of the Whole; but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has called the attention of the Chair to the last paragraph in the rule, which reads as follows:

At the conclusion of the general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the amendments and the bill, and vote shall be had upon the final passage of the bill without other intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Inasmuch as the previous question can not be ordered in Committee of the Whole, that settles the intention of the gentleman who drew this resolution; and the Chair will request the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to preside in the House as Speaker pro tempore. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, under the rule I desire to offer the following amendments to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments. Does the gentleman desire the entire paper read?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the amendments as read and pending. They are the identical amendments provided for in the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that the bill as presented in the House does not contain some of the amendments offered by the caucus. Where are they?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the printed copies of the bill, as agreed to in the resolution which has been adopted, will be on the Doorkeeper's desk shortly.

Mr. MADDEN. Are we going to proceed to the consideration of a bill without the bill before us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The printed bill will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. The Senate bill is printed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the reading of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] for general debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not. This is the presenting of the amendments to the House, and the reading does not come out of the time on either side.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. PADGETT:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "with the approval of the President"; in line 5, page 2, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to"; at the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm or individual citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual, party to such charter or lease, shall violate the provisions of the same.

"The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901.



"The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders, shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

"The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

"Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

"Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

"Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

"The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

"The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

"Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

"At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

"Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

"Sec. 6. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed \$10,000,000, neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

"Sec. 7. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from the proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board: *And provided further*, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.

"Sec. 8. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall not issue any bonds in excess of \$40,000,000 or incur any liabilities other than stock issues in excess of \$10,000,000. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board, and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

"All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States, heretofore made or published by authority of law, shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall as provided hereby take the place of those now in existence.

"The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

"Sec. 9. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutuila: *Provided*, That the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

"Sec. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be \$6,000 per annum.

"Sec. 11. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

"Sec. 12. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace, and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

"Sec. 13. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily, for use as naval auxiliaries of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

"Sec. 14. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

"Sec. 15. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of \$10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 7, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

"Sec. 16. That two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels.

"That the Secretary of the Navy shall in such leases provide for their cancellation whenever such vessels may be required for naval or military purposes.

"That all leases made under this section of the act shall be subject to all of the provisions of section 5 of this act relating to maximum rates and charges and terms and conditions of forfeiture.

"That when the vessels, lands, piers, leases for land or piers, and other property held by the corporation are disposed of as herein provided the corporation herein provided for shall be dissolved and said shipping board abolished.

"Sec. 17. That sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not take effect until two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold that just a moment, until the Chair ascertains the situation? Has the pending bill been read?

Mr. PADGETT. It has not. The bill (S. 5259) ought to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois withhold his point of order and allow the Chair to have the bill read?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the original Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines, by employing such vessels of the Navy as in his discretion are available, without impairment to the paramount duties of the Navy, and as are necessary and appropriate, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining regular communication between the east or west coast, or both coasts, of the United States and either or both coasts of South America



and between the United States and the countries of Europe. The vessels so employed shall carry United States mail, passengers, and freight under such regulations and at such rate or rates as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, and such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired list, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary, shall be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines, and retired officers of the Navy so employed at sea or on shore shall, in all respects, be held and considered to be in an active duty status, and shall receive the pay and allowances of officers of the active list of the same rank and length of service: *Provided*, That officers placed on the retired list on account of wounds or disability incident to the service, or on account of age, or after 30 years' service, shall not be ordered to such duty without their consent.

The enlisted strength of the Navy, as now or hereafter authorized by law, is hereby increased by the number of men required to man the vessels so employed, and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist such number of men in the Navy for such terms of enlistment, not to exceed four years, as may be desirable, and to distribute the number of men so enlisted among the various ratings of the Navy.

SEC. 2. That in addition to and as a part of the line of the Navy there is hereby established an active reserve list. Line officers placed on the active reserve list under the provisions of this act shall be held to be in an active-duty status in all respects, except that officers on the active reserve list shall not be advanced on the active reserve list except for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle, or extraordinary heroism, when their advancement thereon for these causes shall be governed by the provisions of law governing the advancement of officers on the active list for like causes. All laws now in effect with reference to the retirement of officers from the active list are hereby extended to include officers on the active reserve list.

SEC. 3. That sections 8 and 9 of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," as amended by the act approved August 22, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," are so far amended that officers who hereafter volunteer or are selected for retirement as therein provided shall be held and considered to have volunteered for transfer to the active reserve list, or shall be selected for transfer to the active reserve list, respectively; and the transfer of such officers to the active reserve list in lieu of their retirement shall be made subject to the restrictions imposed by the provisions of the said sections as amended.

SEC. 4. That in addition to such part of existing appropriations as may be available for the expenses of operating the line or lines herein provided for, the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy for the purpose of organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on the traffic provided for in this act and in defraying the operating expenses incident thereto: *Provided*, That all money received for the transportation of mail, passengers, and freight, as provided in section 1 of this act, and for such other services as may be incident to the operation of the said line or lines, is hereby made available, in addition to the aforesaid sum of \$100,000 herein appropriated, for expenses incident to the proper conduct of the business contemplated in this act: *Provided further*, That any sum of money herein appropriated which remains unexpended at the end of the third fiscal year after the passage of this act, and at the end of each fiscal year thereafter, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67.]

Alney	Dooling	Kettner	Roberts, Nev.
Anderson	Drukker	Kless, Pa.	Rupley
Anthony	Dunn	Kitchin	Sabath
Avis	Edwards	Korbly	Saunders
Baker	Elder	Kreider	Scully
Barnhart	Estopinal	Langham	Sells
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Shreve
Bowdle	Faison	L'Engle	Smith, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Farr	Leshner	Smith, Minn.
Bruckner	Ferris	Lever	Smith, N. Y.
Bulkley	Fields	Lewis, Pa.	Sparkman
Burgess	Finley	Lindquist	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Gard	Lobeck	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	George	Loft	Summers
Calder	Gerry	McClellan	Talbott, Md.
Callaway	Gittins	McGillcuddy	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantor	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Thacher
Cantrill	Gorman	Maher	Thomas
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Treadway
Carr	Greene, Vt.	Moore	Tuttle
Carter	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Underhill
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mulkey	Vare
Clancy	Hart	Nolan, J. I.	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	O'Brien	Wallin
Claypool	Hay	Oglesby	Weaver
Conry	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Whaley
Copley	Helgesen	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Dale	Hensley	Post	White
Danforth	Hobson	Price	Wilson, Fla.
Davenport	Hull	Ragsdale	Wilson, N. Y.
Davis	Johnson, S. C.	Reed	Winslow
Deitrick	Johnson, Utah	Reilly, Conn.	Woodruff
Dent	Kahn	Riordan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in order that we may thoroughly understand the situation with reference to the two bills in one I will take a little time to explain it as I understand it. The Gore bill, which we are about to vote upon at the end of six hours' debate, is practically the same as the Alexander bill reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries last September and introduced in the Senate by Senator STONE. The bill before you now is a composite bill composed of the Weeks bill, so called, and the Gore bill, so called. The Weeks bill last August passed the Senate practically unanimously; in fact, I think it did pass unanimously. The Gore bill is now pending in the Senate.

We have had assurances from the other end of the Capitol frequently that if the Gore bill could be made a temporary measure much support would be gained for it, and, in fact, some have been led to believe that the Gore bill, under those circumstances, could pass.

Now, what is done in the bill under consideration to-day is to make the Gore bill a temporary measure and abolish the shipping corporation two years after hostilities in Europe are concluded, and at the end of that time put in effect the Weeks bill, which passed the Senate unanimously. In other words, we have given gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol what they say they want in the Gore bill and what they voted for in the Weeks bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. MANN. How are the minority stockholders to be protected when the vessels are turned over under this bill?

Mr. WEBB. That is a matter of detail, but I will answer it. You will have no minority stockholders. I do not think any private party will invest in the stock of the corporation.

Mr. MANN. That is the gentleman's answer—that there will be no minority stockholders?

Mr. WEBB. I think not; it will be a corporation like the Panama Railroad or the Panama Steamship Co., and if there should be any minority stockholders the stock will be paid for when it is turned over to the Navy Department.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. For a brief question.

Mr. TOWNER. If that be the case, and I agree with the gentleman, if this property is to be turned over without compensation, there are no minority stockholders who would subscribe. If this is the case, where would there be any reason for the organization of a corporation at all?

Mr. WEBB. None whatever, except that it is a mere fiction. We did it in the case of the Panama Railroad Co. and in the case of the Panama Steamship Co. It is a mere fiction, which the American people love to follow because of the habit. There is not much real difference between authorizing the outright purchase by the Government of these vessels and the owning and operating of them by a corporation, all of whose stock is owned by the United States.

The Weeks bill, which, as I say, passed the Senate practically unanimously, provides that the Secretary of the Navy may take such vessels as are not absolutely necessary in the Navy Department and use them in the establishment of mail steamship lines, which lines shall also carry not only mail but passengers and freight also.

Now, you would have thought that our friends in the Senate who inveigh against socialism in the Gore bill would have raised a mighty howl against that proposition in the Weeks bill, and yet the principle in the Gore bill is the same as is involved in the Weeks bill, with one exception, and that is that the vessels operating under the Weeks bill shall be operated by naval officers, while those operated under the Gore bill are operated by civilians. I confess that, in view of troubled conditions across the sea, I think it is better at present to have Government vessels operated by civilians rather than have them operated by naval officers in United States uniforms.

Therefore we have provided that the Weeks bill shall be suspended until two years after hostilities cease, and in the meantime the Gore bill shall take effect, so when the Gore bill dies the vessels which the shipping corporation own may be operated under the Weeks bill or may be leased or chartered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.



Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the Gore bill provide that these ships shall go into Alaskan ports and operate to and from Alaska?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir. That was an amendment adopted in caucus last night—providing that Alaskan ports should be included in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is to be treated as a foreign port and not as a coastwise port?

Mr. WEBB. It is to be treated like Hawaii. Hawaii is a Territory, and so is Alaska, and we thought it would be unfair to make a discrimination between different ports, both being coastwise countries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that is a very important matter to be considered?

Mr. WEBB. This is an emergency measure, and it is proposed that the vessels shall go where they are most needed, as I shall show the gentleman later on.

Now, we all, Republicans and Democrats alike, for 25 years have agitated the question of a larger merchant marine.

In 1821 American-owned vessels carried 89 per cent of the commerce of the United States, but from that time to the present hour our American vessels have been carrying less and less of our commerce, until they have almost vanished from the seas. To-day they carry 7½ per cent of our foreign commerce. That commerce amounts to two billions and a half dollars of exports and \$2,000,000,000 of imports, and yet we carry in American bottoms only a little pitiful 7½ per cent of that tremendous commerce. Sir Walter Raleigh, after whom my own State capital was named, at one time said that the Nation that controls the seas controls the commerce of the world, and the nation that controls the commerce of the world controls the wealth of the world, and the nation that controls the wealth of the world controls the world.

England learned this many, many years ago, and although she is little larger than my native State in area, still she has 20,000,000 tons engaged in deep-sea commerce, while our country with a hundred million people has a little pitiful 1,000,000 tons. Everyone agrees that we ought to have a merchant marine, that our expanding commerce demands it, and yet American statesmanship up to this good hour has failed to devise a plan by which that great merchant marine may be built up. Our Republican friends, many of them, have supported the idea that we should go into the Public Treasury and take out the people's money and put it into the private pockets of corporations to build up the merchant marine; but that has not been satisfactory. That has not succeeded. In fact, we subsidize vessels now to the extent of a million dollars a year. That has done no good. England's entire subsidy is only \$3,000,000 a year, and England has twenty times as many tons on the seas as the United States, which has \$1,000,000 of subsidies a year. I say again that something ought to be done, and, if possible, quickly. How shall it be done? The Republican Party has been in power for half a century, and during all that time our great merchant marine has been gradually fading from the seas. It has been a great problem. Of course, land business has been more profitable than sea business. Our Republican friends have tried to revive the merchant marine with subsidies, but with a great Republican majority they have not been able to pass a bill subsidizing merchant ships, for there are always enough Republicans opposed to it who, together with the Democrats, kill it, and the Democratic Party has never stood for that, and we therefore agree that subsidies can not be granted.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Has not the Democratic Party always uniformly opposed every Republican effort to build up a merchant marine by subsidies?

Mr. WEBB. All the Democrats and some Republicans have opposed private subsidies, and we expect to do that as long as we are a party. We believe that it is better to take all of the people's money and spend it for all of the people rather than to take all of the people's money and put it into the private pockets of a few great corporations for their private benefit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the fundamental difference between the Democratic Party and those Republicans who feel like my friend from Pennsylvania does.

Mr. MOORE. What is the difference between taking \$30,000,000 direct from the pockets of the people and buying ships and having the Government enter into an enterprise that involves risks?

Mr. WEBB. If my friend can not see the difference between them, I do not want to spend the time telling him. I ask him to come over and vote for this bill if he sees no difference, because this bill takes \$30,000,000 direct for the use and benefit of all

the people, and not for a few private shipowners. My friend knows the difference, and everyone in the House knows it.

I am willing to answer any question if the question is direct, because I think sometimes we can bring out matters more clearly by questions than we can in general debate if the question is asked in good faith. But I do not want to explain any more the difference between the proposition in this bill and a private subsidy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What effect does the gentleman think the passage of this bill will have on shipbuilding now going on in shipyards of the United States for private shipowners?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I confess to my friend that I can not answer that and nobody else can. I see that all the shipyards are being opened now and are "booming." I suppose if we construct some more ships under this act in the American shipyards it will help the "boom," and if we can not build them in that way we can buy them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has the gentleman from North Carolina observed in the press that some proposed builders who had contemplated giving orders for four ships have cancelled these orders, pending the legislation now under contemplation?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, that is like some of the great factories I have heard of, that close down just before an election and tell the workmen that if they do not vote the Republican ticket they will stay closed down forever. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] That is a bluff, pure and simple, and will fool nobody.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from North Carolina ask the gentleman from Kansas to give the names of those people to whom he refers and to be more explicit?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas to do that a little later. Let us see now if there is any necessity for such a bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say that he was willing to explain certain features of the bill as he went along?

Mr. WEBB. I would not want to go into the details of the bill. I will leave that to Judge ALEXANDER. I can not do it in 20 minutes, but any general question I am quite willing to answer.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is what I want to ask. First, I want to know if the Democratic caucus last evening made any change in the so-called Weeks bill on page 1, lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11?

Mr. WEBB. I have not the bill before me, and I can not answer the question. What is provided in those lines?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman is familiar with the so-called Weeks bill—

Mr. WEBB. I am.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It provides that the Secretary of the Navy might operate naval vessels on certain lines of trade.

Mr. WEBB. I can answer the question. The only amendment made to the Weeks bill was, after the words "Secretary of the Navy" insert the words "with the approval of the President."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is the only change made in the Weeks bill?

Mr. WEBB. That is the only amendment to the Weeks bill, except to postpone its effect until two years after hostilities cease.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WEBB. I hope the gentleman will not insist; I would be glad to yield if I had the time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I wanted information only; I have no idea of delaying the gentleman.

Mr. WEBB. I have only about 10 minutes remaining and I have just begun. I hope the gentleman will understand that I do not intend to be discourteous. I always answer questions, because I think that is a good way to debate matters.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed with my statement, I will yield later, if I have the time. Now, gentlemen, we all agree we ought to have a merchant marine. We all agree, so far, no plan has been presented that will produce that great merchant marine. I doubt if there are 50 men in the Hall who will agree on one particular method by which an American merchant marine may be built up. You may say, Repeal the shipping laws; but you can not do it. The Republicans, I think, would not vote to ever repeal all the shipping laws, and neither will many Democrats, so that can not now be done. The question is, Shall we do something now in the nature of Government control and ownership to save the situation or do nothing? We produce 25 per cent of all the wheat in the world. We pro-



duce 45 per cent of all the pig iron in the world. We produce 40 per cent of all the coal in the world. We produce 60 per cent of all the corn and 65 per cent of the world's cotton. We export 30,000,000 barrels of petroleum oil every year. We have not the vessels in which to transport even a decent fraction of our products. Eight per cent is all we carry in American bottoms, and our exports must be carried in our foreign competitors' bottoms, and will be carried in our competitors' bottoms unless this Congress does something in the present emergency to relieve the situation not only temporarily, but I would like to see it be relieved permanently and forever, and you gentlemen who oppose this proposition ought not to criticize the sponsors of this bill, unless you can present something better in its stead.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not get a chance to present anything, not even an amendment.

Mr. WEBB. Yes; you do. At the end of this debate you have an opportunity to offer your own bill to be voted on.

Mr. MADDEN. You will not even let us offer an amendment.

Mr. WEBB. We provide how it can be done on a motion to recommit, and then you gentlemen will have a chance to show how you would build up a merchant marine.

Mr. GLASS. They had the opportunity for 40 years and did not do it.

Mr. WEBB. They have had the opportunity for half a century to build it up, and during all that period the merchant marine has been growing sadly less. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any necessity for an emergency merchant marine as provided in this bill? Is there any man who denies that the exports of the United States are being hampered by the checked and clogged conditions in every port in the United States? Only on the 6th day of this month the collectors of practically every port in the United States telegraphed to the Secretary of the Treasury the conditions with regard to commerce in each particular port, and without an exception the collectors wired that all the ports were jammed, clogged, and crowded with wheat, cotton, corn, lumber, tobacco, and many other products ready for export, with no ships to take them. Can we as American Representatives afford to go to the country and say we have no way by which we can relieve that situation, but must let our commerce be clogged, choked, and left to rot and die because you do not want to embark the Government on an idea of ownership and control of vessels in order to relieve that situation and keep the commerce and business of this country from dying?

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. I would prefer not just now. My time is limited. I do not desire to be discourteous to the gentleman, and if possible I will yield later.

Mr. STEENERSON. Only for a question.

Mr. WEBB. When I get through I will be glad to do so. In some of the ports the collectors wire that the railroads had placed embargoes on any further delivery of cargoes into those ports. What are we going to do, gentlemen? What are we going to do? Are we going back to our people and tell them that we can do nothing? Are we going back to them and tell them we tried to do nothing?

If you gentlemen on that side have any better scheme than this one, pray present it. You ought to have presented one long ago. We have tried to get together on some bill to relieve this terrible situation, but in some parts of this Capitol they seem to be fiddling while Rome is burning. It is an emergency situation. The life, health, and blood of our entire commerce depends upon something being done for it and on its being done quickly. It will not do to wait, even six months or two years. The patient may die, stagnation may set in, and worse business conditions may spring up than even those already created by this terrible war in Europe. That is not the worst of it. We not only have not the vessels—because practically all the German merchant vessels have gone out of business and numbers of other vessels have been taken over by the warring nations as naval auxiliaries—consequently we have a great scarcity of merchant vessels at a time when we need them most. We now have an opportunity that few nations in their history ever had, in reference to foreign commerce, and the thing that is needed to make it blossom like the rose and return prosperity in great waves is sufficient ships, with reasonable freight rates, to carry our commerce abroad to the people who want it.

Not only, my friends, is there a scarcity of vessels, but the men who own and control the great Shipping Trust, both foreign and domestic, know they have the American people by the throat, and instead of charging normal or twice normal prices they have run rates, in some instances, up a thousand per cent,

and just last December they took out of the shippers, out of the pockets of the American people, \$18,000,000 more than normal freight rates. In 12 short months if we can save to the people of the United States an average of \$18,000,000 per month, we would have saved them \$208,000,000, and with this result attained at the end of that time you could afford to burn all the vessels that we could buy under this bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WEBB. I would rather not. Cotton, the great staple that has always kept the balance of trade in the United States—its exportation has been hampered because, instead of charging the normal price of \$1.25 a bale, these high-sea pirates are charging \$17 a bale to carry it across the ocean, and other freight rates are being raised in proportion. I ask you what you are going to do? Are you going to let foreign and domestic trusts rob us and not try to break loose from that strangle hold?

This may not be a perfect measure, but it is a patriotic measure, and men ought to join in in order to relieve this situation as best we may. You say it is Government ownership. That has no terrors to me. Long ago this country went into Government ownership—from the days of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln down to the time of William H. Taft and Woodrow Wilson. We have been in the Government control and ownership of interstate highways and business for a hundred years, and if there was ever a time when we should engage in it that time is now. Thomas Jefferson ordered a great highway surveyed from Baltimore to New Orleans. Has the Government a right to build highways? Yes. A little later on the Cumberland Road was ordered to be built, a great interstate-commerce road from Cumberland, Md., to Jefferson City, Mo., and they spent \$710,000 to build it. And in Abraham Lincoln's administration great transcontinental railroads needed to be built, and the Government got behind them and built them, and in many cases practically controlled them. And not only that, they built the same kind of road from Chicago and Cairo to New Orleans. In 1904 the Government of the United States authorized the building of the Philippine railroads and guaranteed 4 per cent interest on their bonds. That is on the statute books now, and a Republican Congress passed it, and they let the building materials go into the Philippine Islands duty free, even though they were such strong protectionists in those days. And then there was the parcel post. For years and years we heard the cry that "you are going to put the Government in the carrying business in competition with private enterprise, the express companies. Do not dare to put the Government in the business of carrying small packages." But the Government went into it, and is in it, and where is the man who now would vote to repeal it—the parcel-post law?

The Government is carrying freight on land. Why not carry it on the sea? We authorized the Alaskan Railroad. We make powder and armor plate and many other things that private individuals not only make, but want to make. Here in our foreign commerce is the situation that private individuals can not meet even if they wanted to. But human hands fail and are unable and the Government steps in; there is no paternalism in the proposition. We print envelopes and sell them to the people of the United States. We are in the stationery business, and private individuals want to do the work. We destroy the cattle tick and the boll weevil and do thousands of other things. And not only that, I suppose that many of you on that side of the House voted to put the Government into the insurance business.

Mr. MANN. We voted against it very decidedly, and it has proven a failure.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman will have to wait and give us more time before he can say that—

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is not a failure. The Government is writing war-risk insurance at one-eighth of 1 per cent.

Mr. WEBB. The war-risk insurance bill passed the Senate, and the Republican Senators who are now holding their hands up in holy horror against this shipping bill voted to allow the Government to insure the cargoes that are carried abroad in monopolistic ships. I can not see the difference in owning the ships that carry the cargoes and the Government insuring the cargoes which the ships carry. I have no metaphysical scissors with which I can make a distinction in principle.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not think we voted for that on this side of the House?

Mr. WEBB. I think a number of you did.

Mr. MANN. A very small number.

Mr. WEBB. Well, I am sure that quite a number of Republicans in the Senate did, and also a goodly number of Republicans in the House.



There are others who say this bill is unconstitutional, because there is no warrant in the Constitution that gives the Government the right to do this. That is worn-out doctrine. That has been declared otherwise by the Supreme Court for many, many years, and I refer gentlemen who care to read on this point to the case of *Wilson versus Shaw*, reported in the Two hundred and fourth United States Reports, where a man by the name of Wilson undertook to restrain the building of the Panama Canal, and the Supreme Court, Justice Gray speaking for that court, said it has too long been settled under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States that Congress not only has the power to construct railroads but create corporations for the purpose of building railroads and constructing canals and operating them. There is your highest authority in this country construing the Constitution with reference to the building of railroads and canals. If we have the power under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution to build railroads, maintain them, and operate them, why have we not the right under the same clause of the Constitution, which is granted in the same identical language, to maintain and build a line of ships to foreign countries?

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. Just for a question.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman make a distinction between the authority to regulate commerce and authority to engage in commerce?

Mr. WEBB. That point has been made many times, but the Supreme Court says the point is not well taken.

Mr. MILLER. And that is the distinction the Supreme Court has made every time it has been before it.

Mr. WEBB. The Supreme Court says the contention is not sound. If it were the court would have restrained the building and operation of the Panama Canal. They say we have the right to build the Panama Canal under the interstate-commerce laws of the Constitution. Under that commerce clause we can establish, regulate, and operate a ship line or lines to foreign countries.

Now, if we can establish railroads and build canals, we can also establish a ship line on the sea, because we have the same power on the sea with reference to foreign commerce as we have on the land with reference to interstate commerce. I shall not take the time of the House to read what Mr. Justice Gray said, but if any of you are in doubt about it, I ask you to read it. I will, without reading it, put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. You will not put it in the RECORD unless you read it. I am going to object to all extensions.

Mr. WEBB. I hope the gentleman will not filibuster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have served as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries ever since I have been a Member of this House. Since the Democratic Party came into power in 1911 I have never filed a minority report against a bill brought out by the majority of the committee, of which my friend from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, is chairman, until I prepared a minority report upon this bill.

The hearings on the bill (H. R. 18666) which was reported to this House were only of one day's duration, and the only person who appeared before us as representing the Government was the Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the United States Treasury. The members of the committee tried to ascertain from him what was intended by the bill; whether it was intended to go into the overseas foreign trade or whether it was intended to go into the South American trade. We obtained but very little information from him, and most of the information furnished was that it was intended to go into the South American trade, but that it was, as we well knew, in the power of Congress to do whatsoever it pleased. And when some of the members of the committee raised the question as to the advisability of the bill providing for Government ownership, his answer was: "Leave the matter to the President. You all have confidence in the President. Leave the whole subject to him."

I replied that I thought the Congress of the United States should take the responsibility rather than have the President of the United States take all the responsibility for the pending legislation. The report of the majority of the committee was filed on the 5th day of September, 1914. I obtained permission from the House of Representatives on the 8th day of September to file within five legislative days the minority report, and the minority report was filed on the 13th day of September. And nothing has been heard from the other side of the House,

with their great majority, in regard to this bill until we are confronted to-day with a bill which no one has had a chance to understand or consider. We are met with a bill to-day without any hearings having been held upon it, without any definite explanation of what it is to be; but we learn from the newspapers that it was agreed to in a Democratic caucus held last night. It is not even printed for the information of the House, and yet we have this bill brought before us for final action and debate limited to three hours.

At the time the original hearing was held before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries it was represented that a great emergency then existed; that we could not wait for anything to be done except to act upon the bill that was then presented. It was suggested there by one of the members of the committee that we should admit the vessels mentioned in the bill to the coastwise trade, and when that proposition was brought to the attention of the committee I made the suggestion that if that subject were introduced it would mean a delay in any final action on the bill, whether that delay occurred in this House or in the other body at the northerly end of the Capitol, and that such a proposition would lead to interminable debate. Consequently that project was thrown aside, although the Secretary of the Treasury kindly informed us that he himself had no objection to that proposition, and that he would like to see it carried into effect.

Mr. Speaker, allusion has been made to the fact that the party now in power has its first opportunity to bring in a bill for the building up of the American merchant marine in the presentation of this Government-ownership bill. If I recollect rightly, when the Panama Canal bill was passed an amendment was placed upon that bill that brought out the exact Democratic theory, and that was the right to buy ships in the markets of the world. That has always been the Democratic argument in opposition to every proposition that we put up to build up the merchant marine—that if they only had the right to go into the markets of the world to buy ships they could build up a merchant marine.

The Panama Canal act provided that vessels could be bought in the markets of the world, but that vessels thus purchased should not be over five years of age. That provision of the bill was tested. Not a single vessel was bought under that proposition. Then that limitation was stricken from the bill, in order that all who desired might buy with perfect freedom—buy vessels of any age, in any way that they could get them. That finally resulted in no purchase of vessels, and at last a ship-registry bill was provided. Unfortunately, I did not happen to be present in the House when the bill was brought up and hastily rushed through the House, but a ship-registry bill was provided, and it was put in the discretion of the President of the United States to provide that foreign watch officers might be engaged to act in charge of these vessels thus purchased if it was found necessary. That bill finally passed both branches of Congress, and the next day thereafter the signature of the President was attached to that bill. He also granted the right to put foreign watch officers on every one of these vessels granted an American registry, and then an attempt was made to put these vessels into the coastwise trade of the United States, but this attempt failed of consummation by the action of the Senate.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I decline to yield.

Now, the coastwise trade of the United States was established in 1787, and when that trade was established it was provided that it should be confined to American-owned, American-built, and American-officered vessels; and this proposed extreme change in policy was one that I am sure would not be made with the approval of the American people. Some of the most prominent Democrats I know called my attention to the fact that the admission of such vessels, with such officers to take charge of the same, to the coastwise trade would be an unwise act that would take away our means of defense, which had been practically provided for by the men who had manned these vessels year after year since the coastwise trade was established in 1787.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is it not true that the United Fruit Co. of Massachusetts and the Standard Oil Co. and the United States Steel Corporation were the ship companies that asked to have the law extended as to the captains and watch officers?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not know who asked for it. I am not familiar with the action, except as I read of it in the newspapers. But I do know the President granted that



privilege, whoever asked for it, without stopping to consider the importance of the question, after the Congress had given him the discretion to act.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not an interesting fact that the administration yielded so readily to the request of the United Fruit Co., the Standard Oil Co., and the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes. It is peculiar, because the Democrats have been abusing the Standard Oil Co. and the United States Steel Corporation and the United Fruit Co. for, lo, these many years. That has been their stock argument ever since they have been in existence.

But, gentlemen, I find that my time is so limited, and I have promised so much of the time granted to me to others, that I have very little time that I am privileged to occupy myself.

One great argument made by those on this side of the House and those upon the other side who have opposed subsidies to vessels in the foreign trade was that if we subsidized vessels and put them into the over-seas trade, it would cause an increase in freight rates, and that if an increase in freight rates resulted the farmer would be injured, because he would have to pay larger freight rates. Now, the fact is that since the breaking out of the war—and that terrible war is the cause of everything troublesome now with our friends on the other side of the aisle—it is true freight rates have been very largely increased, but the price of farm products does not seem to have been reduced, and as far as I have been able to ascertain the farmer delivers his freight at the dock in this country and the man who buys the farm product across the broad ocean pays the freight.

Mr. GORDON. The consumer pays the freight.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes; the consumer on the other side of the water pays the freight. Therefore the argument that has been presented heretofore on this side and on the other side of the aisle has been dispelled, and if no other proposition has been settled by the discussions arising from the great European war that one proposition has been shown to have no foundation in fact.

Now, gentlemen, I shall not take any more time myself, although I would be glad to do so if time would admit. I desire to yield to gentlemen who undoubtedly will be able to present this case much better than I am able to present it myself. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, upon this bill the fundamental propositions in controversy are few. In the short time allotted to me I wish to discuss two propositions which have not had the attention which I think their importance deserves. They may be stated as follows:

First. What will be the international status of the ships procured under this bill?

Second. Can these ships carry contraband without violating our neutrality and possibly involving us in war?

The second proposition is dependent upon the answer to the first.

As to the status of these ships the supporters of the bill take the position that inasmuch as a corporation is provided for to acquire the ships, and the United States is only a majority stockholder, and inasmuch as it is expressly provided that the ships shall be regarded in all respects as private ships are regarded, that therefore no foreign power can claim that they are public ships or subject to any different rules or treatment than private ships would be. While this is the contention of the supporters of the bill their position has not been sustained, and it can not be. On the contrary, in our international relations these ships are Government ships, and they may be so treated by any foreign power. The only effect of the creation of the corporation proposed in the bill will be to give to any foreign power the option of treating them as either Government or private ships.

Upon this proposition I would observe, first, that any laws that we may make can not bind any foreign power. We can not make a law regarding our own affairs and then declare to Germany or Great Britain that they are bound by what we have done to limit any rights that they might otherwise have. The form of the ownership amounts to nothing internationally. If we, the Government of the United States, own them to the extent of exercising control over them as a proprietor, and we will do so under this bill, we can not escape responsibility to a foreign Government by declaring we have created a corporation in which we are the principal stockholder and the title is in the name of the corporation. The question will be, "Does the

Government of the United States control them to the same extent as if operated directly by it?" The answer must be "Yes," otherwise the only reason given for the passage of this bill would disappear. If, then, the Government controls them, then the Government is responsible for whatever they may do.

International law is well settled as to this proposition. I shall give only two short quotations from Moore's Digest of International Law, page 878:

The measure of a neutral's obligations is to be found in the rules of international law, and it can not shelter itself by the allegation that its own legislation imposes a laxer standard on its subjects.

The duties of neutrality by the law of nations can not be either expanded or contracted by national legislation.

This last quotation is from a great Democratic Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard.

I have searched diligently all the arguments that have been made in behalf of the bill to find some authority for the claim that the United States has the right to shield itself behind a corporation, so far as our international relations are concerned, but have found not one. The eminent advocates of this legislation either can not understand or willfully misunderstand the point involved. They cite a number of bank cases where the sovereign power was a stockholder, and the question at issue was whether the corporation bank was subject to suit in the Federal courts. It has been uniformly held that in such a case the sovereign power could not interpose as a defense its sovereign capacity. But that question is not in issue at all here. Everyone must admit that the United States may waive its sovereign rights by the creation of a corporation in the manner proposed in this bill. If a foreign power chooses so to do, it may treat its ships as private ships and subject them to the international law relating to private ships. That is not in issue. The issue is whether a foreign power is bound to do so. Will a foreign power have the right to treat them as public ships and hold the United States responsible for them, if they choose so to do? The answer must be "Yes." We may waive our sovereign rights over these ships, but we can not waive our sovereign responsibilities.

The tremendous importance of this will be seen in the discussion of the second proposition, "Can these ships carry contraband without violating our neutrality and possibly involving us in war?"

Granted that these are public ships, for which we are in our sovereign capacity responsible to foreign powers, then it is well settled in international law that they can not carry contraband at all without violating our neutrality. A citizen may carry contraband in his private ship and his doing so will not violate the neutrality of his Government. He takes the risk of capture and confiscation of his cargo, but that is all. The Government can not carry contraband at all without violating its neutrality.

Again quoting from Moore's Digest of International Law, page 865:

It is no offense, either against the law of nations or against our neutrality statutes, for a citizen of the United States to sell munitions of war to a belligerent; yet it could scarcely be contended that the Government would be justified in employing its agents to promote such transactions.

Do I need to argue that if these ships carry contraband these ships would be an agency of the Government to promote the transaction?

The reason for the exemption of the Government from violation of its neutrality by the act of one of its citizens in carrying contraband is stated in Woolsey, International Law, sections 193 and 194. I quote:

If the neutral (Government) should send powder or balls, cannon or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from the neutral position. \* \* \* Now, the same wrong is committed when a private trader, without the privity of his Government, furnishes the means of war to either of the warring parties. It may be made a question whether such conduct on the part of the private citizen ought not to be prevented by his Government, even as enlistments for foreign armies on neutral soil are made penal. But it is claimed to be difficult for a Government to watch narrowly the operation of trade, and it is annoying for the innocent trader. Moreover, the neutral ought not to be subjected by the quarrels of others to additional care and expense. Hence, by the practice of nations, he is passive in regard to violations of the rules concerning contraband, blockade, and the like, and leaves the policy of the sea and the punishing or reprisal power in the hands of those who are most interested, the limits being fixed for the punishment by common usage or law. \* \* \* It is admitted that the act of carrying to the enemy articles directly useful in war is a wrong, for which the injured party may punish the neutral taken in the act.

Here the reason for the distinction between a private trader and a Government ship, so far as neutrality is concerned, is made plain, and it is the law.

It must, then, be admitted that if these are public ships they can not carry contraband at all without violation of our neutrality, while private ships may do so. This brings us to a consideration of what constitutes contraband of war. Our own



Supreme Court has defined contraband of war to be articles manufactured and primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war. Articles which may be and are used for purposes of war or peace are contraband only when actually destined to the military or naval use of a belligerent. The United States has had a fairly consistent policy in the treatment and definition of contraband of war, but the practice of other nations is involved in hopeless confusion and inconsistencies. A careful study compels one to the conclusion that there is practically nothing produced that at some time or other has not been declared contraband by the great powers of the world. In our war with Spain we find in the list of absolute contraband, horses; in the list of conditional contraband, coal. England once declared contraband all grain, flour, or meal bound to any port in France. In 1885 France declared rice destined to certain portions of China as contraband. In 1905, in its war with Japan, Russia placed cotton upon the contraband list. Without giving further instances, we all know what is happening in the present war. The list of contraband articles is being enlarged every month, and it is impossible to say from day to day what has been declared to be contraband by one or the other of the belligerent powers. In the case of a private trader these are the chances that he takes, but let a Government ship have a cargo that England or Germany declares to be contraband, and we may be immediately met with the charge of having violated our neutrality, the result of which might be war. Because of the inexcusable limitations of time, this question can not be given such discussion as its importance deserves, and I must content myself with this very imperfect presentation.

To sum up, the ships provided for in this bill will be public ships, so far as foreign powers are concerned, if they choose to so regard them, and we in our sovereign capacity will be responsible for their operation. These ships can not carry contraband at all without violating our neutrality. As to what is contraband is so uncertain that we could not, without the risk of grave complications, engage in trade at all with any of the belligerent countries. If we can not engage in trade with them, then the reason for the bill fails.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I am afraid I can not. If I have time, I will yield later.

There is another phase of the matter which I would like to discuss, but I have not the time. I can only state the proposition. It is: These ships, being public ships, must not discriminate against any of the belligerents in the trade carried on by them. If they do, we violate our neutrality. If this bill passes many in this country will insist that these ships engage in the German trade, on the ground that English ships are constantly carrying cargoes from the United States to England; and, therefore, if we would be strictly neutral, that we should devote the ships to the German trade to equalize our exports. To this England would strenuously object. Aside from the international complications involved, there would be complications at home, public opinion would become inflamed, and consequences might follow which would be most unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, serious and delicate questions are daily arising, and I will not vote for this bill and add uncounted new ones. A vote against the bill can work no serious injury. Every Member who votes for it, if it should become a law, may regret his vote to his dying day.

Some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle treat this matter lightly. The day may come—God knows we all hope it will not—when you may realize that instead of blindly following any man, however great and patriotic he may be, you owed it to your country in this hour to vote your own convictions and not those of some one else's. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] 10 minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I can not begin without thanking the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LENROOT] for his careful presentation of the dangers of this bill. But there is danger also in the way that this bill comes forward. It is not merely that it was reported six months ago and now comes before this House as a caucus measure at the end of the session, but that we have heard it stated that gentlemen have been assured that unless it is passed in the few remaining days of this session there will be an extra session. That means that every Member of this House is threatened with a sentence of six months' confinement at hard labor in a tropical climate, away from home, and likewise that he will be sentenced to pay expenses, and so be fined at least \$1,000; and he is also told, if the statement in the morning papers be true, that such an extra session would be the political suicide of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. How can a great measure be considered under

those circumstances, with no power of amendment and only the power to say "No"?

I am going to give only two thoughts as to this bill, full as it is of features which are subject to criticism.

The first four sections are known as the Weeks bill. They provide that the ships of the United States Navy shall be fully manned with retired officers, civilians, and new enlistments, and that the Navy shall be got ready for use; and that meanwhile, as we have an exigency in our foreign trade, especially with South America, those ships which can be spared shall be used in that foreign trade. When that bill was passed in the Senate it was insisted and admitted that it was a temporary measure to meet a temporary exigency and to be passed now for that exigency. This present bill passes the Weeks Act not for this exigency but for kingdom come; not for the needs of the present trade, not for the needs that may come upon us because of the danger of war and the need for enlarging our Navy, but to be without effect until two years after the European war shall have ended and shall have been so declared by the President. It reminds me in its value of a will that was probated, in which a man reserved to himself the use of his real and personal property at the resurrection. And if it is a comfort to the majority party who have introduced this proposition to know that that will was sustained as not made by an absolutely insane man, I will give them that consolation; but the good of the Weeks bill is gone when it is postponed until the need for it will not exist.

How many minutes have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am anxious to yield back some of my time. The rest of this bill is a novelty. It was reported six months ago. It proposes that the United States of America shall own or control a corporation which shall buy, build, equip, or charter merchant ships. There are none to be had anywhere except those in harbor belonging to one of the belligerents. Any other ships must be built. This corporation has leave to charter its ships to whom it pleases, and to do business under a shipping board composed of political officials who know nothing about it. The only ships that it can get are useless as freighters, and that is the only kind of ships for which there is a demand. These fast ships are ocean liners meant for passengers, and very few people are going to Europe to spend their money there now. These provisions bring us at least into a doubtful realm with reference to our relations with foreign countries, for while they provide that we shall not do anything with those ships that is not neutral, the very purchase is doubtful as to neutrality. Such provisions imperil this country, and for no good. They drive Americans out of the shipping trade instead of encouraging them to go into it. We want Americans at sea.

I will say only one word more. I am ready to stand for postal or freight subsidies, as other countries have done, or for a tonnage subsidy, but I have always proposed something that I thought better, and that was to pay the difference in cost between the running of an American ship and a foreign ship, which is caused by the cost of American labor. I was always ready to vote for a bill which would say that the United States would pay to any shipowner the difference in cost of the labor of the captain and crew that was aboard the American ship, compared with a foreign ship, or, if necessary, more than the difference, but based on the men being there and their being enlisted in a naval reserve. [Applause.]

That is a single and separate proposition, and would go directly to the evil that prevents Americans being at sea. I have no time to debate it now. If this bill were before the House, I would offer that bill as a substitute, because I believe that the country and the House are determined to have something that will induce Americans to go back on the seas. Unfortunately this is an act to prevent their going back on the seas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to have a better audience, and I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-two Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.



The Clerk called the roll, and the following-named Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68.]

Ainey	Gallivan	L'Engle	Scully
Anthony	Gard	Lewis, Pa.	Seldomridge
Avis	George	Lindquist	Sherwood
Barchfeld	Gerry	Loft	Shreve
Barnhart	Gillett	McClellan	Smith, Md.
Bartholdt	Gillmore	McGillcuddy	Smith, N. Y.
Bartlett	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Sparkman
Broussard	Gorman	Maher	Stanley
Brown, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Bruckner	Guernsey	Mondell	Sutherland
Brumbaugh	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Burgess	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Hardy	Murdock	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hart	Neeley, Kans.	Thacher
Carew	Hay	Nolan, J. I.	Townsend
Carr	Hayes	O'Brien	Treadway
Carter	Hill	Oglesby	Tuttle
Cary	Hinds	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Clancy	Hinebaugh	Peterson	Vare
Conry	Hobson	Plumley	Walker
Copley	Hoxworth	Porter	Wallin
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	Post	Walsh
Dale	Jones	Price	Walters
Danforth	Kahn	Prouty	Watkins
Deltrick	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale	Weaver
Dixon	Kettner	Rainey	Whaley
Doolling	Kless, Pa.	Rauch	Whitacre
Dunn	Kitchin	Reed	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Korbly	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Faison	Kreider	Rouse	Woodruff
Falconer	Langham	Rupley	Woods
Fitzgerald	Langley	Sabath	
French	Lee, Ga.	Saunders	

The SPEAKER. On this call 289 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me a moment?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of this side of the House for a moment. We have consumed a little over one hour in debate this morning and an hour in roll calls. It will be impossible to get through with this bill by midnight unless Members remain in the Chamber and maintain a quorum at all times. There are two or three more appropriation bills still pending, and those who have a lingering hope of getting away from here on the 4th of March will simply destroy that hope by not remaining here, and thus wasting the time.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY. I will state that some Members did not catch the terms of the rule this morning and think that the bill will be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. I think the gentleman should explain that at the end of the six hours' debate the vote will be on the bill and the pending amendments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; the rule provides that at the close of the debate the previous question will be ordered and the vote will come on the bill and amendments to final passage. Members must realize that we lose half an hour or more on every roll call.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I hope the admonition of my friend from Missouri will be given due attention, because there is not a quorum of the House here now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes that Democrats will all stay here.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker knows the Republicans will.

The SPEAKER. And he also invites the Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, we will stay.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder the Democrats do not want to remain in the House during the discussion of this bill; a great many of them have consciences and they do not want to break records for personal independence that up to this time have been creditable. The bill they are asked to support, partly at the dictation of the White House and partly because of the party caucus, is a bill which does not propose to build up American industries; it is a wreckage bill pure and simple. Gentlemen on the other side have suggested that opposition to this bill comes from the so-called Shipping Trust. None are better posted in regard to the Shipping Trust than

the gentlemen who make that allegation; there is absolutely no information on this side, so far as I know, concerning any such institution. The Democratic Party will again reverse its professions about the trusts if it passes this bill. It will do this even at the risk of forsaking the plain people, for whom it has professed such undying love. The Democrats used to inveigh against the Guggenheims in Alaska, and it was charged that certain privileges were being granted to extend railroads in that country. Then Democrats were on the alert; they had a great deal of information about the Guggenheims and the great railroad trusts and private monopolies, but it did not take long after the present administration came into power to pass an Alaskan government-ownership bill for the very purpose of buying out the so-called Railroad Trust in Alaska, and if our information be true, that is what is actually occurring under the direction of this administration.

When the railroads of the country were complaining because the freight rates were insufficient and because they were losing money, notwithstanding the Democrats for 16 long years had denounced the railroads and had made all sorts of charges against railroad trusts, 62 very distinguished railroad men and representatives of the "big interests," most of them coming direct from Wall Street, called upon the President of the United States, and shortly thereafter a statement was issued from that quarter indicating that the railroads of the country ought to have a fair show, and that perhaps there had been too much hue and cry against the so-called railroad trusts. That the railroads themselves are not now so unfavorably regarded by this administration has been demonstrated during the last few days, when the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its freight-rate ruling, has indicated that the railroads ought to be preferred even as against the Panama Canal. These things should not be forgotten when we are discussing trusts.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen who raise the cry of "the Shipping Trust" against the men who oppose this bill desire to get from under. They seek to find a refuge from the wrath of the people whom they intend, in this instance, to rob to the extent of \$30,000,000, direct taxation, for the purpose of buying foreign ships and putting American shipyards and American workmen out of business. Some of the gentlemen who have spoken, and, in particular, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], have called this bill a bill to build up the American merchant marine. That is a grave mistake. This is a bill to buy foreign ships built in foreign shipyards, not for the purpose of building up an American merchant marine, but for the purpose of transferring the business of building ships from American shipyards, where American wages are paid, to foreign shipyards, where cheap foreign labor prevails.

Gentlemen have intimated that there is a reason for the passage of this bill, because it is said that freight charges have become excessive on the high seas. When a man owns a vessel and there is a great demand for that vessel to carry freight, it is no more unnatural or illogical that he should ask a higher rate of freight for that service which is so greatly in demand than that the cotton planters of the South should combine not to sell their cotton until they obtain a certain price. But gentlemen have contended, and particularly the President of the United States and his very active Secretary of the Treasury have urged, that it is because of excessive freight rates in ocean carrying business; that there is a necessity for buying these foreign ships and taking this American money and transferring it to foreign shipyards, thus displacing American labor. In this regard they are in error. I have said in one or two previous addresses here that there is no abnormal congestion of freight on ordinary business at the various ports in this country. The congestion is due to speculation because of war conditions. I have read into the RECORD statements from men who know, not collectors of the ports nor men who have been solicited for their opinion by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, nor men who are brokers for the purchase of ships, but men actually in the business of shipping and men who to-day will find all of the ships that are necessary to carry the normal business of the country. They say ships are still to be had and that legitimate business is being relieved. Who, then, is it that wants to purchase these foreign ships, and what is the purpose in making the purchase?

There is heavy pressure on the part of those who desire to send cotton out of the country. Cotton is going out in greater quantities than ever before. The Bureau of the Census proves that in its January report.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not. There is heavy pressure on the part of those who want to send oil out of the country. Oil is going



out in tremendous quantities. There is heavy pressure on the part of those who want to send steel and war munitions out of the country. That means trouble for the country. But if you have any doubt about who wants this ship-purchase bill passed, about who wants the people to pay \$30,000,000 for these foreign ships, I recur, for historical reasons, to that interesting conference at the White House in August last, just prior to the passage of the war-risk bill. The gentlemen on the other side of the House, it will be remembered, rushed the war-risk bill through in great haste about that time.

Some of you have said that the Republicans voted for that bill. I question whether a dozen on this side voted for it—Republicans and Progressives put together. It was a Democratic bill, and you are entitled to all the credit, if you consider it creditable to spend \$5,000,000 of the people's money in that way. But since this shipping bill is up, I want you to recall the circumstances under which the war-risk bill was passed. Do you remember who it was representing the "big interests" who went to the White House to discuss this and other matters? Let me read to you the names of a few of the 62 who went there with the eminently respectable Seth Low, of New York, as chairman: Mr. Samuel Rea, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., was one, an excellent Democrat and a great railroad engineer. Remember, the discussion was about freight rates and the necessity of taking \$5,000,000 of the people's money and putting it into the business of insuring risks for those who wanted to send contraband to sea. There was too much risk in this, even for the marine insurance companies. They were willing the Government, which means the people, should take it. Mr. Alfred H. Smith, president of the New York Central Railroad Co., was another of these gentlemen; Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., who deny they are interested in the purchase of foreign ships or have any direct connection with the Hamburg-American Line or any other line, was another one of them; Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan—it is not necessary for me to state who he is—was another of these gentlemen; and so was Mr. Frank H. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank; and that other distinguished representative of "big interests," to whose great organization reference was made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], Mr. James H. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation. There were 62 of them in all, and pretty heavy financial timber. Oh, but what a reversal of opinion there was either before or after that visit! Oh, how those who had been proclaiming "the rights of the downtrodden people" began to see a new light! Oh, how those who had been denouncing "the trusts" of the country changed their views after this memorable visit of the illustrious 62! And, by the way, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] whether it was not the United States Steel Trust that had asked to register its ships under the American flag, and the answer was "Yes." Why was that question asked unless your war-risk bill was framed, not for the benefit of the poor people of this country, not for the benefit of the ordinary shippers, but for the benefit of the United States Steel Trust or the great corporations whom you have seen fit heretofore to denounce?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. No; I can not—

Mr. ALEXANDER. I simply desired—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE. I have but 12 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri has ample time. Oh, there is a congestion of freight, is there? That is the reason you want to pass this bill. Look over the report which Secretary McAdoo and Secretary Redfield sent to the Senate of the United States, and see how this thing was built up; see what splendid press agency work was done; see how the collectors of the ports were made use of; see how the Cabinet relied upon the men who knew how to buy ships at a high price and sell at a low price. When you have done this you will begin to get some light upon the subject. Congestion in business at the ports! No ships to carry freight! I want to submit that in the month of January, 1915, there were enough ships to carry more cotton and grain than was carried through half the year in 1914. In the single month of January, 1915, we exported on ships, which were obtainable, from all ports save that of New York—and the New York figures are not yet compiled by the Department of Commerce—we transported a total in value of foodstuffs from the United States into foreign countries, with a plentitude of ships to carry it, \$41,579,756, as against \$11,042,318 in January, 1914. Nearly four times as much was sent out on ships in January, 1915, as we sent out in January, 1914. In bushels for the month of January, 1915, from all ports except that of New York—and New York exports were also exceptional, as will be seen when the figures come in—we sent out in bushels of wheat,

January, 1915, 18,906,545 or nearly 19,000,000 bushels, as against 4,985,148 bushels in 1914; about four times as much in January, 1915, as we sent out in the month of January, 1914. As to cotton and oil—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ].

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I want to be understood as being opposed on principle to governmental ownership and fads of that kind. I call them fads, but we are up against the proposition to-day, and while we hear about the doctrines of Jefferson and others, it is to be remembered that they are all dead and we are right here. I think changing our navigation laws would solve the problem, but we have not the nerve to do it. The Republicans for 20 years did not have the nerve to do it; so we must find some other remedy. I am a shipper, and I represent shippers. Cotton and wheat are not the only things in this world. Other products are handled, and to-day I am obliged, in bringing cargoes from Europe, to pay 75 shillings a ton as against 20 shillings before the war, and I am asked to sign a contract for a year at that rate and to bind myself not to ship a pound by any other line. That is no new condition; we have always had that, especially to New York. Now, who pays it? Some one made the remark that in normal times the shipper pays the freight, as in the case of the wheat grower the price is fixed in Liverpool. I will concede that to this extent, that the export price of wheat and cotton, for instance, is fixed in Liverpool. I will take wheat, and not cotton, as an illustration. That price includes the freight to Liverpool, which is added to the price of the wheat. Now, when the Shipping Trust, the trust you are all speaking about, or the shipping monopoly, has got hold of you, it fixes the freight rate, which, plus the cost of the wheat, makes the price in Liverpool; but suppose that some firm in Liverpool brings goods on from South America on other lines, or a competing line, at a much lower freight rate. The grower in South America gets a much higher price than the farmer in the United States, and to that extent the freight is paid by the shipper. In all other cases not analogous the ultimate consumer pays it.

Now, then, there is some talk about buying interned ships. I would buy every one of them except the big passenger ships, and take chances on the complications. I do not think we ought to buy any ship of over 10,000 tons. It is a freight traffic we want and not a passenger traffic. I hope sometime the law will be amended so that bought ships can go into the coastwise trade, so that a ship carrying cotton from Galveston to Europe ought to be permitted to bring a return cargo to New York, and there take on a coastwise cargo, instead of being compelled to go back to Galveston in ballast for more cargo.

I do not want this arrangement permanent, but I am opposed to a time limitation in the bill. If you put in this law now the clause to stop it in two years after the war, the steamship people will know in two years that we will be out of business, and lie back and keep up the rates, and buy your ships for junk at that time. If, however, after two years, competition has brought down rates so low that the ships do not pay, no Congress will go on very long appropriating funds and run at a deficit. On the present basis I do not care what you pay for a ship, it will pay for itself in a year's time, even if freight can only be had for one way, and the return is made in ballast. Figure it yourselves. I have had occasion to do so. You can afford to scrap all your ships in two or three years, and still save money for the people on to-day's rates, if they were maintained.

Mr. MANN. Why would a man sell it then?

Mr. METZ. All right; if he will not sell, then you will not get any. What are you kicking about if nobody will sell them? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. You may get them at a very high price.

Mr. METZ. If you are going to put crooks in office who will do that kind of thing, that is up to us. I do not propose to have that kind of men if I can help it, and I do not believe our President does. We want goods that are under embargo, such as rubber and wool. You may send them in English bottoms. You go to South America for a load of rubber, and what will they tell you? It is British property, and it must be transported in a British ship. I guarantee if it was down there and was your property you could bring it in American bottoms; but you can not do it to-day. You have not the bottoms to send. Those are the things that are going to count.

I claim the credit of sending the first ship abroad with an American flag when this war broke out. The marine insurance on some of the cargo she brought went to 17 per cent. Our boats are not built for trans-Atlantic traffic, but for coastwise traffic. The Holland-American Line ran 70 boats out of Rot-



terdam in October and November, all loaded with freight for American ports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. METZ. They chartered Danish, Norwegian, Swedish—any kind of a boat except American. They could not afford to take those. Among them was the steamer *Laura*—an old tub that took 44 days to cross the Atlantic with freight for this country. Now, when we send goods abroad, unless they go in American boats, they are held up by the English Government. You can not afford to charter a boat of any kind and have it held up in England three or four weeks on a time charter. American boats will not be held up long; and they will not be held up if we show backbone in this administration, and I am willing to say that we have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman be willing to take a chance on war?

Mr. METZ. If my rights are attacked, I would be willing to take a chance on any kind of war. When anybody tells me I can not do anything I have a right to do, I am going to fight for that right. When I am told I can not send foodstuffs here or there, I for one would fight for my right to do so. We do not have to be dictated to. If we do buy interned ships, we can use them—can release vessels now going to South America for other ports.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has any consideration been given in committee or Democratic caucus to this question of return cargoes—at length?

Mr. METZ. I can assure you it was discussed in Democratic caucus with all the knowledge at our command. You can not get return cargoes from all ports at the present time. Of course, it depends on where you go—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has not that something to do with it?

Mr. METZ. The trust ships have return cargoes. The ships that have not return cargoes are the ships we are sending with cotton to German ports. I can get cheaper ocean freight rates on my goods from Germany to New York by sending them by railroad to Bremen, and get as low a rate of insurance out of Bremen as any other port, as I can on the Holland-American Line from Rotterdam, with its cheaper water rate down the Rhine to Rotterdam. The shipowners have got us. That is all there is to it. If this is only a club with which to break in, I am willing to spend \$30,000,000 to show that we can do it. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, you gentleman on the other side of the House have 145 majority, and, of course, you can pass any bill that you propose. Only part of the bill we are proposing to pass is before the House. Certain amendments were made last night by the Democratic caucus that are not yet in print, and yet the Representatives of the American people on the floor of this House are called upon to enact a law that is not before them.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield to anybody now. You are bound by caucus action. You have no right to think for yourselves. You are trying to jam something through this House that the American people do not want. Legislation is no longer enacted by the House as a deliberative body. It is brought in here after deliberation all night in a Democratic caucus. This bill was prepared on the outside. Nobody in here had anything to do with its preparation. You propose to spend \$50,000,000 of the people's money to enter upon a doubtful enterprise at a time when everybody is taxed beyond his power to bear it, and when more than 4,000,000 American workmen are out of employment. And this will not give employment to any American workmen—not one. You are opening employment bureaus everywhere now. It would be much better for the American people if you would open the workshops and the factories and give them a chance to make a livelihood. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You keep on taxing the idle people of America on their necessities, adding to their daily burdens by your extravagance and wasteful expenditures of the public money. You continue to empty the Public Treasury at the expense of the necessities of the people. You authorize the organization of a ship company in this bill. You give that company \$10,000,000 out of the Public Treasury. You authorize the issue of \$30,000,000 of bonds, and perhaps \$40,000,000, as the case may be. You add the opportunity for this corporation to increase by \$10,000,000 more the capital that they may employ. You authorize the shipping board to repeal all the navigation laws and to make any kind

of laws they please, but you give them no power whatever, when this bill ends, to restore the navigation laws under which America works.

You are engaging in competition with private enterprise. You are endangering the peace of America. You are going to carry contraband to the belligerent nations. You are going to violate the neutrality of America and involve the people of America in trouble with Europe. Can you afford to do it simply for the purpose of enacting a law, under whip and spur, because the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States demand it? You have made it a party measure by dictation from the President of the United States. This ought not to be a party measure. This is a business proposition, in which every citizen of the United States is interested. You will buy ships at an extravagant price and you will sell them for a song when you get through with this thing, after it proves to be a failure.

You give away the power of Congress to legislate and place it in this shipping board when you authorize the shipping board to make navigation laws. You throw the people of the United States into a condition of uncertainty and fear. You destroy their activity by the uncertainty which you create, to say nothing about the burdens which you will lay upon them in the matter of increased taxation to meet the whims of those who want to enter upon the purchase of these ships in order that they may satisfy their ideas of Government ownership.

The country is opposed to this legislation. There have been protests from every section of the country against the enactment of this bill. The people of the country are impatiently waiting for the time to come when they can express their opinions in opposition to this character of legislation at the ballot box, and in November, 1916, the Democratic Party will no longer have an opportunity to foist upon the American people such iniquitous and nefarious legislation as is proposed in this bill. Pass it if you will, but remember that you will be held accountable by a long-suffering people for your action. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used six minutes, and has yielded back four minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we upon this side admire the performance of our Democratic friends to-day. We admire the facility and volubility with which they praise the President on the floor and curse him in the cloakrooms. [Laughter.] We hope that some day you will have the courage of your convictions, and I prophesy now that this is the last bill the President will ever force through Congress against the judgment and the conviction of the majority of his party. [Applause on the Republican side.] I think this is the beginning of the end of his dictatorship.

Now, our Democratic friends come to-day and they desert free ships, discriminating duties downward, a free Panama Canal, and every other remedy that they have ever advocated for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. And yet the father of all these failures with simple faith comes before the country to-day and insists that this last misshapen and sickly child, born of socialism and cupidity, is the only thing that will give us a merchant marine, and in order to demonstrate that they are right, with true Democratic logic, they point with pride to the fact that heretofore they have always been wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, what is the exact question before us to-day? The exact question is, Shall we purchase the interned German ships? That is the question. If you were to do away with that proposition, the enthusiasm for this bill would disappear in 24 hours. If that is not the purpose of this bill, then the whole proposition is childishly absurd. There are no other vessels to be purchased.

There is a distinct conviction throughout the country to-day that there is some understanding between those who control the Hamburg-American vessels and certain distinguished gentlemen who are insistently urging this legislation. Whether it is true or not there is an aroma surrounding this bill to-day that has already condemned it in public opinion.

What is the position of foreign countries in regard to the purchase of these interned ships? Let me read it to you:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which the enemy vessel as such is exposed.



That is the position of the allies. What is the position of Germany? Let me read that, as declared on the 4th day of last August:

Ships that after the outbreak of hostilities have been transferred from the enemy to a neutral flag are also to be considered as enemy ships.

Those declarations are plain. Anyone can understand them. It does not take a lawyer to construe them. And the very moment that we buy one of these vessels and start to run it upon the high seas, that moment it is subject to seizure, and that moment we must be prepared to defend ourselves against Germany or against Russia, Japan, France, and Great Britain.

Now, suppose that one of these vessels is seized. It is taken into a foreign port. We protest. And suppose that protest is refused. They will do the construing of the law in their court in their country. Then what? Then we are placed in the cowardly and pusillanimous position where we must either say that we are right but have not the courage to enforce that right or else we must go to war.

Now, are we prepared to take that position? That is the question to-day that, above all others, we are to consider in the passage of this bill. It is not our duty to see how nearly we can come to war and escape it. It is our duty to keep as far away from war as possible.

It is our duty to-day above all things else, not only for our own country but for the sake of humanity, to maintain neutrality, and to maintain that neutrality with honor. Now the question is, Shall we to-day, for the small benefit that might come, embark upon this new and untried socialistic path condemned by experience and by the common sense of mankind? Are we going to take chances of being involved in the greatest conflict that has ever devastated this planet for the little advantage that might come to us, even if we concede that this bill would do all its friends claim for it?

The greatest question in regard to the passage of this bill is this: Shall we, on account of an anxiety on the part of some for the dollar; shall we, because of a desire to purchase a few secondhand ships, and run them in the foreign trade, so long as we run them at a loss; shall we, for the sake of being able to get a few bales of cotton or a few bushels of wheat to Europe for a few cents less; shall we weigh these things in the balance against our country's peace and perhaps our country's existence?

May we be saved from the madness of such leadership, intoxicated with a little brief authority, and may we remain in the paths of peace and national honor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Missouri now occupy some time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitude of the Republican Party as illustrated in the remarks upon this bill to-day by members of that party in the House, a declaration made some time ago is peculiarly interesting and significant. I will read it:

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying trade is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

That is a quotation from the Republican national platform of 1900, in which the Republican Party, deploring the condition of our foreign trade and our merchant marine, prophesied the condition which we are experiencing to-day. They are certainly entitled to the distinction of being a true prophet of evil, because that which they prophesied has arrived, and in tragic form.

There can be no doubt of the fact that an emergency confronts us. We have to-day of American vessels registered for foreign shipping of all sizes only a little more than 1,000,000 tons, about 2 per cent of the world's gross tonnage. There is a dearth of foreign ships to be added to the insignificant number of American ships with which to carry our commerce. Evidence can be multiplied, so that the most skeptical must be convinced that at the ports of our country American farm products and manufactured products of various kinds, noncontraband products if you please, are demanding carriage across the sea in order to be delivered to those who are willing to purchase them and able to pay for them. What is the attitude of the Republican Party in view of its professions in 1900, which have been repeated in scarcely less emphatic language in every national platform since that time? Although in power in the executive

and legislative branches for almost 20 years, that party has done absolutely nothing to revive the American merchant marine in our foreign trade.

It is true that in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and in several Congresses succeeding, the Republican Party endeavored to report and pass a subsidy bill. But that bill was so full of favoritism, and it was so plainly recognized to be the covert of selfish interests, that even the Republican Party in the House, in a large majority at that time, would not support it. The public sentiment of the country in both parties is opposed to subsidies.

What other remedy has been proposed? That of discriminating duties, which also had the approval of the national Republican Party in its platform. And yet it remained for a Democratic Congress, in framing the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill, to place in it a discriminating duty of 5 per cent. That was not sufficient. In my opinion, it ought to be larger. And yet that is the only legislation upon our statute books in 50 years by either political party of this country intended to enlarge our merchant marine in the foreign trade.

Others have suggested that our navigation laws be amended. Yet every Republican and Democrat who is entirely candid will admit that even if it were a practicable remedy and would give the needed relief promptly we could not pass through Congress any repeal of the navigation laws as applicable to our foreign shipping.

So, Mr. Speaker, this condition of our foreign trade has been brought about under Republican control of the Government, and the fact remains that the only legislative effort made for its amelioration has been by the Democratic Party.

Now, in this emergency, which I have briefly described, what is the attitude of the two parties here? What does the Republican Party propose? Absolutely nothing. It has not offered, in either branch of Congress, any constructive piece of legislation intended to give relief to this dearth of shipping, this paralysis of our foreign commerce, to the detriment of our industry and our prosperity. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress have proposed the pending bill. Certainly in this emergency the Democratic Party confronts the country as the only constructive party, while the Republican Party, with all its boasts of past heritage and achievement, has absolutely nothing to propose in the dire conditions that confront us.

What are the arguments they bring against this measure? They allege that our neutrality will be violated and that we will be in danger of war. Gentlemen know that these professions are insincere, in the face of the attitude of this administration for peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to my friends for this ovation, and I shall requite it by yielding five minutes to the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] and reserving the remainder of the 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] five minutes.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, manifestly it is not possible within the brief time at my disposal to-day fully or satisfactorily to discuss the important measure under consideration; and yet I desire as fully as possible to present certain reasons which seem to me conclusive, from its economic aspect, why I should support this measure.

Logically a complete discussion of the subject and of the bill under consideration would involve (1) a statement of relevant facts, and a just conclusion to be drawn as to the necessity or the wisdom of embarking upon the proposed course; (2) the merits of the bill itself, as a whole and in detail; and (3) certain international legal questions which have been urged against the expediency of the policy proposed and of the bill itself.

As to the last-indicated question: Because of the limit of time imposed upon me, I must content myself in passing to say that, having carefully collated, briefed, and considered the prize-court law of each and all of the great powers of the world—the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Austria, Spain, Japan, Italy, Holland, Russia, and France—only France has ever declared any position in that matter denying the citizens of any neutral country the right to purchase, in good faith and for a valuable consideration, from the citizens of any belligerent country merchant ships even after a declaration of war, and even France has never resolutely adhered to that position, having abandoned it at least once upon the insistent representations of the United States and later in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870; and therefore that it would lead the United States into no embarrassing international complications if her citizens, or if the shipping board created by this act,



should purchase, during the present European war, ships interned in our ports and belonging to citizens of any of such European belligerents.

As to the details and merits of the bill under consideration: As no serious question has been raised in this debate upon its provisions, I must content myself to state that, in its scope and in its details, it is sensibly constructed to accomplish the purpose intended, namely, to enable the United States to acquire, either by purchase or construction, or both, and to operate, a merchant marine in the interest of the entire American people to accommodate their foreign commerce at a reasonable charge for a regular service under fair conditions.

And therefore my remarks will be limited to a consideration of the economic phase of the subject under discussion.

There is presented here to-day exactly the same party spectacle I have observed during the two years I have served in this body, upon every occasion involving an important issue—the Republican Party is hiding behind some specious pretext to protect special interests, while the Democratic Party is championing the just rights of the masses in their struggle for economic independence and industrial freedom. At the end of two years of extreme trial the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Wilson, is still a forward-looking party, and continues to take its stand against special privilege in every form and in favor of the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Sir Walter Raleigh said:

Whosoever commands the sea commands trade. Whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and, consequently, the world itself.

But the United States, as the richest nation in the world, having more than \$140,000,000,000 of wealth, occupies admittedly the most insignificant position, in the matter of its merchant marine, of any great nation on earth. For a half century the country has heard much concerning an American merchant marine; but the fact remains that during that period of time the American merchant marine has faded from the high seas, until it is now practically a negligible factor in the world's commerce.

Our country contains only one-fifteenth of the population of the earth, but it produces about 70 per cent of the world's corn, 65 per cent of its petroleum, 63 per cent of its copper, 60 per cent of its cotton, 42 per cent of its iron ore, 40 per cent of its coal, 35 per cent of its tobacco, 30 per cent of its live stock, lead, and silver, 25 per cent of its wheat, and 20 per cent of its timber.

With its 60,000,000 head of cattle, its annual production of 240,000,000 barrels of petroleum, 763,000,000 bushels of wheat, 2,500,000,000 bushels of corn, 60,000,000 tons of iron ore, 550,000,000 tons of coal, and 15,000,000 bales of cotton—its total annual farm products amounting to some \$10,000,000,000 and its total manufactures amounting to some \$21,000,000,000—after supplying our own people with food, clothing, and manufactures of every sort, out of these enormous resources, the people of this Nation are able annually to ship to foreign countries for sale a total of about \$2,500,000,000 of American products, and to buy back from foreign lands for the use and convenience of our own people something like \$2,000,000,000 of their products.

I mention these stupendous figures only to illustrate the imperative necessity that, either by private capital or by some form of public ownership, adequate shipping facilities be provided to accommodate this enormous commerce and traffic.

We have realized, since last August when the European war began, how entirely dependent our American commerce is and has been upon foreign bottoms, and how helpless the American people now are in the face of this awful calamity. They have known for many years, in a general way, that this Nation had no adequate merchant marine, and our manufacturers, merchants, and shippers have in many different ways brought to the attention of the Congress the fact that the greater part of American import and export trade was carried in foreign bottoms; and yet the people have deluded themselves with the thought that they had at least a respectable merchant marine. Indeed Lloyd's Register points out that the American merchant marine comprises some 3,100 vessels of more than 5,300,000 tons gross register. But those figures when analyzed are a delusion; for when the number of vessels which are used upon our canals, lakes, bays, and rivers are taken from such total of 3,100 vessels, it leaves only 361 American vessels of 1,375,000 gross tons capacity used or capable of use in our deep-sea shipping. It is the tragedy of this awful European war which has emphasized American marine helplessness.

It was not always true that America had no considerable merchant marine. As late as 1821, 90 per cent of our import and export shipping was done in American bottoms; but the

proportion has constantly declined, so that it was 86 per cent in 1831, 83 per cent in 1841, 72 per cent in 1851, and 65 per cent in 1861. Then, during the period of our Civil War, because the Confederate cruisers were able to destroy the American merchantmen at sea, American owners sold their ships to foreigners rather than let them lie idle and go to pieces. For instance, during the period of 1860-1867, the American merchant marine was sold to foreigners in rapidly increasing volume, as is illustrated by the following table:

American ships sold to aliens, 1860-1867.		Tons.
1860	-----	17,518
1861	-----	26,649
1862	-----	117,756
1863	-----	222,199
1864	-----	300,865
1865	-----	133,832
1866	-----	22,117
1867	-----	9,088

And in passing it may be remarked that the same nations which are now belligerents in Europe were those which thus bought the American merchant marine when the United States were engaged in war; and yet in this debate gentlemen insist that the citizens of the United States have no right to acquire any of the merchant marine of any of the European belligerents at the present time. It would be interesting to know by what process of reasoning gentlemen justify those countries now belligerent in Europe in purchasing the American merchant marine when we were at war and at the same time deny to the United States the right to purchase in good faith and for a fair price merchant vessels belonging to the citizens of those belligerent European nations now that they are at war.

But even at the end of the Civil War the decline did not cease in the amount of American deep-sea shipping carried in American bottoms, because only 32 per cent was carried in American bottoms in the year 1871, 16 per cent in 1881, 12 per cent in 1891, and only 8 per cent in 1901, while immediately before the outbreak of the European war in August, 1914, it is doubtful if 5 per cent of our foreign shipping was carried in American bottoms. In practical effect our merchant marine has disappeared from the high seas. An American traveler in foreign ports will almost look in vain for a mast carrying the Stars and Stripes. This is not only a humiliation to our national pride but it is an annual drain of some \$250,000,000 on our American enterprise paid to foreign shipowners; and, in addition, the existing condition places our American farmers, merchants, bankers, manufacturers, and other shippers at the mercy of their foreign business rivals by having to charter their ships under such terms and conditions and at such times and places as their foreign rivals may dictate.

It is an alarming and lamentable condition to contemplate that, with our population of nearly 100,000,000 people—the most progressive, capable, industrious, and ambitious on the earth—producing annually some \$10,000,000,000 in value of agricultural products and some \$21,000,000,000 in value of manufactured products, with our population increasing rapidly and our lands being rapidly settled and developed, and, consequently, with our necessity constantly becoming more urgent speedily and economically to reach all the countries and population of the globe in the sale and exchange of our enormous surplus annual output, while they are now providing one-eighth of the total foreign commerce of the world, yet they carry only one-tenth of that one-eighth—that is, 1½ per cent of the world's commerce—in American ships; and the amount of cash paid to foreign shipowners for carrying our foreign commerce exceeds \$250,000,000 per year in normal times.

Evidently and certainly something, either in law or in economic conditions, is fundamentally and radically wrong, because this condition should not obtain. The major portion of the difference between American exports and American imports each year is paid by the American people to owners of foreign ships to carry on that import and export trade in normal times; and thus, instead of our people saving that \$250,000,000 per year, they are paying it for the labor, capital, and ships of foreigners when the American people might better thus employ their own capital and labor, build up their own merchant marine, and save that enormous average annual drain of \$250,000,000.

Solidly upon the Republican side of this House, and in considerable numbers upon the Democratic side, the contention is made with zeal and earnest insistence that American private capital can and will supply an adequate American merchant marine.

It is always a difficult matter to determine what activities the Federal Government should undertake. Personally I do not believe the Government should go into those quasi public enterprises in which private persons and capital can and will engage to a sufficient extent to provide adequate facilities. I



magnify the individual rather than the Government. That conviction is intensified by my observations and experiences in public life, where I have noted the vast political power and insistent demands of the multitudes of Government employees now in service in many different departments. Besides, in a Republic it is of first importance to recognize and to encourage individual initiative and enterprise. But it is surely a sound rule to observe, in the preservation and development of this mighty and growing Republic, that where the safety, health, development, prosperity, and happiness of the masses imperatively demand that any public or quasi public facility be provided, if private persons with private capital either can not or will not provide it on terms that are fair and just to the public and on a scale commensurate with the legitimate public needs, the Federal Government itself should provide such facilities. This same principle applies with American cities involving their water, their lighting, their power, and other systems as with the Nation which has sanely applied it to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars spent upon its rivers and lakes for domestic commerce, its many harbors, the Panama Canal—which has cost the Government \$400,000,000—and its many other fields of public endeavor.

I say with entire conviction that if private capital would and could build and operate an adequate American merchant marine there would be neither necessity nor desire that the United States embark upon that enterprise at all. But it is clearly evident that American capital either can not or will not provide a merchant marine adequate to the requirements of our foreign commerce. While some \$600,000,000 is invested by American private capital in American ships, representing some 3,100 ships in all, still of the number only 361 ships, valued at \$69,000,000, owned by American persons, firms, and corporations, are engaged in deep-sea shipping, and they carry only from 5 per cent to 8 per cent of our foreign commerce. That is proof conclusive that if the American people are to have an adequate merchant marine they can not depend upon private capital to supply it; certainly not under existing laws. And yet, both as auxiliaries for the American Navy as transports, supply and hospital ships, colliers, and scout cruisers in times of war, and as carriers for American commerce in times of peace, it is indispensable that an American merchant marine be provided if our naval defense is ever to be made secure, if American industry is ever again to be free from the toll of \$250,000,000 annually to foreign shipowners in normal times and double or treble that sum in war times, as now obtain, and if ever again the American flag is to fly in foreign ports upon the mastsheads of American merchantmen as a symbol of untrammelled American commerce.

Many different devices have been suggested, and many have been proposed from time to time in the Congress, to extend or revive our merchant marine. It is undisputed that it costs from 50 per cent to 60 per cent more to build merchant ships in the United States than in foreign shipyards. This is in part because of our duties under our tariff laws laid on the many different articles entering into ship construction, in part because of the high scale of American wages, in part because of the more elaborate finish of American boats, in part because no American shipyard has yet adopted, as has long since been done in British and other foreign shipyards, a uniformity of model or design, and probably in part because we have developed a less efficient working system because of less work and training in constant shipbuilding as in certain foreign countries, where the pursuits of the sea are a national necessity, habit, and passion. And it is undisputed that it costs from 25 per cent to 35 per cent more to operate an American-owned ship than it does a foreign-owned ship on account of our laws and our labor conditions.

But all of the discussions and all of the proposals have come to naught during the past 50 years. Effort has been made to remove the tariff duty on the different materials out of which merchant ships are built. Admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry has been advocated. The Congress has many times in the past considered changing in various ways our navigation laws, and as continuously failed to accomplish that end. Effort has been made to subsidize American shipping, and thus to put a burden on the American people of an amount sufficient to equalize the difference between the cost of manufacture and operation of American ships as against those made and sailed under foreign flags; but all such efforts have likewise failed. It is perfectly certain that the Democratic Party will remain true to its ancient principles to oppose subsidy in any form; and when the Republican Party was in power for 16 years, from 1896 to 1912, it was never able to change the national laws so as to grant either direct or indirect subsidy to American shipping and thus to attempt to equalize the

difference between the cost of construction and operation of American and foreign ships.

It ought to be evident to all of us that at present, as in the past, the navigation laws can not be changed, because the labor unions of the country resist that change upon the ground that any such change would involve the lowering of the standard of American wages, and Congress will continue to heed, as in the past it has heeded, that insistent view.

This is not a time—this awful national and international crisis through which we are passing—for anything but plain words, spoken with candor although with fraternal kindness; and therefore I assert unequivocally that American private capital is not to be condemned in its initiative and in its courageous aspirations when it declines to go extensively into the business of constructing American ships which cost from 50 to 60 per cent more than similar ships constructed in foreign shipyards, nor for not extensively operating in the foreign trade American ships which cost from 25 to 35 per cent more to operate than it costs to operate similar ships on the same passage under a foreign flag. But, while thus exonerating American private capital from the blame for having failed to provide an adequate merchant marine, it is idle longer to continue to act upon the theory that private capital can or will under existing laws and under existing cost items provide that indispensable facility to American commerce.

I have stated that normal American commerce pays foreign bottoms \$250,000,000 per annum for its service, but that is not the only disquieting factor involved in our situation. At the present time, and for the past six months when the great nations of Europe have been in war, in part because they have taken out of the avenue of foreign commerce vast numbers of merchantmen to use as transports for troops, in part to place exclusively in their own service to supply their own people in these times of stress, and in part because interned in American and other ports, vast numbers of foreign ships commonly employed in our carrying trade are denied to us, causing great congestion of shipping at our ports, with the result of poor prices for our products of the farms, mines, ranches, and manufacturing. This illustrates the utter folly and weakness of our reliance upon foreign bottoms. And one of the evidences of human frailty—to take advantage of misfortune in others in order to reap profit—is shown in the fact that foreign and American shipowners alike have availed of American necessities to extort enormous additional tolls from American commerce. It has been conclusively demonstrated that we can not depend either upon foreign bottoms as a sure source of our supply, or upon either foreign or American bottoms to give at all times an adequate service for a fair compensation. The following facts, indicated by the report of the actuary of the Treasury Department, are highly illuminating: Taking July, 1914, when the world was at peace, and using the month of January, 1915, as a comparison, when the world was in the midst of international war conditions, it will be found that from the port of New York the cost of shipping grain to Liverpool has increased 300 per cent and to Rotterdam 900 per cent; flour, 300 to 500 per cent; meat products, from 50 to 150 per cent; and cotton, from 400 to 700 per cent. From Philadelphia and Baltimore the cost of transporting all of these products has risen in about the same proportion. From Galveston the cost of shipping grain to Liverpool has increased during January, 1915, over July, 1914, 174 per cent, while the cost of shipping cotton from the port of Galveston to Liverpool has increased 361 per cent; to Genoa, 420 per cent; and to Bremen, from \$1.40 to \$17.50 per bale of 500 pounds weight, or 1,150 per cent.

These rates are so enormous that for the year 1915, in addition to the ordinary \$250,000,000 to be paid to foreign bottoms by American commerce, an additional amount of \$311,000,000 will be extorted from the American people. If present conditions continue during the year, as to the volume of our exports and as to the rate of charges obtaining for their transportation, it will mean something like \$560,000,000 of American money to be paid to transport American products—nearly all of it going to foreign shipowners. It is a condition that is appalling to any man who is a patriot and as such has the industrial freedom and the economic independence, as well as the political welfare, of the American people at heart. While no one would contend that all of that added burden of extortionate freight tolls will fall upon the American producer, still it is entirely certain that the American producer must of necessity receive very much less for his products than he otherwise would receive but for these excessive tolls.

Since, then, it is certain that American private capital has not gone into the business of constructing and operating an adequate American merchant marine, and since it is so inadequate



that it accommodates only 5 to 8 per cent of American deep-sea shipping, and since it is evident that it is not possible presently or in the early future either so to change our American registry or navigation or other shipping laws as to make possible the building by private capital and their operation of an adequate merchant marine, and since the exigencies of this European war have clearly demonstrated that even our American-owned ships are quite as greedy and extortionate and quite as anxious to take advantage of the helpless condition of our foreign commerce as even their foreign rivals, it appears to me to be a plain duty of the statesmanship of this hour to devise a means to free our people from foreign shipping domination and their industry from the great toll annually paid to foreign bottoms in normal times and the exactions of unbridled greed in these present times.

We have devised and now tender to the Congress the bill now under consideration which we are confident will accomplish that legitimate purpose. The \$40,000,000 it provides for the establishment, either by construction or purchase or both, of an American merchant marine to be used as auxiliary of our Navy in time of war and as transport of our foreign merchandise in time of peace, while a large amount is yet insignificant measured by the results which it would achieve of benefit to the American people. Indeed, it would be returned to the American people seven or eight times over this present year 1915 in the item alone of the excess charges they will pay to the shipping monopoly over the amount they would have paid for the same service this present year but for the war emergency that has arisen.

Gentlemen here have urged that it is futile to pass this bill at the present session of Congress, because a large part of American agricultural products and manufactures have already moved abroad, and that possibly the European war may end before ships could be purchased or constructed under this bill to accommodate American commerce. But I call their attention to the fact that if the war in Europe should end this day it would take at least another year for international shipping conditions again to become normal, and that during that time our people will have raised another \$10,000,000,000 crop, a large part of which must be exported, and will have manufactured probably \$20,000,000,000 worth of products, a large portion of which must also be exported, and therefore that congestion in shipping, rather than a proper accommodation of shipping, even in the event the European war should soon end, will probably result. It is of equal or greater importance that the surplus wheat and corn of the Northwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle of the mighty farming regions of our country, the enormous bulk of other American products, and the vast volume of American manufactures to be produced during this year, and most of which will actually be ready for export within the next six to nine months, may be exported when produced and ready than the export of the balance of the existing crop of products and store of merchandise.

The financial chaos and the crash of our entire industrial system which would inevitably follow from the breakdown of even the existing system of employing foreign bottoms to carry American exports and imports, unless some adequate system be provided in its stead, are incalculable and incomprehensible. In practical effect it is no less than the demoralization, if not the destruction, of our proud national position and our civilization itself. In the face of such a recognized possible national calamity petty views of opinion, or even serious differences as to principles of government, should not have determining weight with us who are charged with authority and duty in this national and international crisis.

I am not one who believes that this shipping enterprise should be made a mere temporary or emergency measure; for, independently of the existence of the European war, which has emphasized our practically total dependence on foreign bottoms for the transport of American exports and imports, the fact would still obtain that there is no considerable American merchant marine, although private capital has been invited to occupy that avenue of investment and enterprise ever since this Government was established and notwithstanding the Government itself has never undertaken that work. But this war has emphasized the fact that in such a crisis our people are powerless in their dependence even upon foreign bottoms for a sure supply, although both foreign and American bottoms have extorted from threefold to eightfold the tolls they have charged American commerce in normal times. I am not willing, as a Representative, that the American people shall thus continue wholly dependent in this important matter of their foreign shipping, which involves their national prosperity to so great an extent, upon the merchant ships of their commercial rivals or upon the greed and caprice of either private-owned American or foreign ships. In

effect their present condition robs our farmers of the fruits of their toil, hampers the legitimate growth of American agriculture, stock raising, mining, manufacturing and other industries, cripples the pride of all of our people, hinders the normal expansion of their commercial activities, extorts undue tolls from their industry, renders them dependent upon the grace of their foreign rivals, places them subject to the greed and caprice of the shipping monopoly, strips American labor, capital, and industry of an enormous proportion of their annual earnings, and fetters the free and daring spirit of American initiative, enterprise, and industrial ambition; and such condition will continue to exist until the people themselves, through their Government, establish their own merchant marine.

I am confident that the American people will never consent, once the Government shall establish a merchant marine, that it discontinue that function and thus again make them subject to the interests and the greed of the American and foreign shipping monopoly. Besides, if it is now enacted that this measure must be temporary, its life expiring with any stated interval or emergency, both American and foreign shipping will understand definitely the extent of this Government's rivalry and can shape their selfish conduct at the expense of our people accordingly. Furthermore, it is not certain whether the shipping board provided by this act may find it best to construct or to purchase merchant ships under the provisions of this bill. This measure should not be a temporary palliative, but a permanent and heavy bludgeon in the hands of the American people with which to strike monopoly on the head. It should also be recognized that sailors are not made in a day and shipbuilders are not made in a day. Both require time and experience in order to acquire skill and efficiency. American shipyards can not hope to maintain efficiency to compete with foreign shipyards merely by the construction of an occasional battleship, and therefore our Nation must remain without skilled shipbuilding artisans unless some permanent policy be pursued making an avenue for the training of American skilled artisans and sailors. This fact looms very large in view of the enormous Navy we have built, on which some \$1,600,000,000 have been expended since the year 1901, but which is even now, in the face of national peril, wholly without an adequate accompanying supply of auxiliaries such as this bill would provide in time of war. To my mind it is conclusive that a permanent policy which this bill should inaugurate will produce shipyards and docks and piers and artisans and sailors requisite to our naval and merchant marine uses, whereas a temporary policy in the nature of an emergency measure can not accomplish these desired results.

But, above these conditions perhaps, arises in my mind the still higher conception of the duty of statesmanship to the American people—that of providing for them in their collective capacity an indispensably necessary permanent means of enabling them to exchange their surplus products with the nations and peoples of the whole world upon ocean-freight terms that are fair and are not, as at present, largely confiscatory.

I would see our people free and unfettered in the conduct of their vast foreign commerce, as I would see them free and unfettered in all other respects involving their freedom, prosperity, and happiness.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to wake up the sleeping Democrats, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59.]

Ainey	Claypool	Flood, Va.	Hobson
Anthony	Copley	French	Hoxworth
Avis	Cullop	Gard	Hughes, W. Va.
Barnhart	Dale	Gardner	Jones
Booher	Danforth	George	Kahn
Broussard	Davenport	Godwin, N. C.	Kelster
Brown, N. Y.	Dent	Goldfogle	Kelley, Mich.
Brown, W. Va.	Dooling	Gorman	Kennedy, Conn.
Bruckner	Driscoll	Graham, Ill.	Kettner
Burgess	Dunn	Graham, Pa.	Kitchin
Burke, Pa.	Edwards	Gudger	Knowland, J. R.
Burnett	Elder	Hamill	Kreider
Carew	Estopinal	Hamilton, N. Y.	Langham
Carr	Fairchild	Hart	Langley
Carter	Faison	Hayes	Lee, Ga.
Cary	Fitzgerald	Hensley	L'Engle



Lewis, Md.	O'Brien	Slayden	Walker
Lewis, Pa.	Oglesby	Smith, Md.	Wallin
Lindquist	O'Hair	Smith, N. Y.	Walsh
Lloyd	O'Shaunessy	Sparkman	Walters
Loft	Patten, N. Y.	Stevens, Minn.	Watkins
McClellan	Prouty	Taggart	Whaley
McGillcuddy	Rauch	Talbott, Md.	Whitacre
McGuire, Okla.	Reed	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Fla.
McKenzie	Riordan	Taylor, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Maher	Roberts, Nev.	Thacher	Winslow
Mondell	Rucker	Townsend	Woodruff
Morgan, La.	Rapley	Treadway	Young, N. Dak.
Neely, W. Va.	Sabath	Tuttle	
Nelson	Scully	Underhill	
Nolan, J. I.	Shreve	Vare	

The SPEAKER. On this call 302 Members—a quorum—answered to their names.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill because I have studied it and believe it is a thoroughly constitutional and a thoroughly Democratic measure. I am going to support it because my district, almost unanimously, is for this bill. Every newspaper, daily and weekly, published in my district is for the bill, and every public organization in the city in which I live—the Cotton Exchange, the Merchants' Exchange, the Business Men's Club, the Lumber Exchange, and every other business organization, I believe—is committed to it. Two great staples from my part of the country are vitally interested in it—cotton and lumber. It is an emergency measure for those two products especially, and various other products, and we are suffering greatly because of a lack of shipping facilities and because of extortionate rates, and I believe we ought to pass this bill to remedy the trouble.

There is another reason why I am in favor of it—and I want to say to my Democratic colleagues and my Republican colleagues that I am not ashamed to say it, but am proud to say it—and it is because a great Democratic President, the leader of his party and the leader of his country, is in favor of this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I intended to say something which I have already prepared about other features of this bill and of this debate, but my attention is going to be diverted for the short time I have to some of the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The gentleman from Washington has never been able to see anything good in President Wilson. He is the most prejudiced man on this subject I ever saw. Nine or ten months ago no man ever so bitterly attacked another as the gentleman from Washington attacked the President of the United States on the floor of this House because he would not go to war with Mexico. Daily, almost, he abused him along this line and exhausted the vocabulary in his harsh and unjust and prejudiced criticism, and yet to-day we hear the gentleman from Washington coming before us as a disciple of peace, afraid to give this power to the President, afraid to give this power to the administration, because, says the gentleman from Washington, he is afraid that the President will involve our country in war. Ah, Mr. Speaker, that is not what is the matter with the gentleman from Washington. Last spring, when he was decrying against the President about not warring on Mexico, we found the Oil Trust and the Fruit Trust and the Steel Trust and the Sugar Trust desiring this Government to intervene in Mexico, and we found the gentleman from Washington and those who believe with him lining up with those trusts and against the President of the United States. What do we find here to-day? We find the gentleman from Washington lined up again with one of the greatest trusts that this country has ever known—the Shipping Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In abusing the President of the United States it is the same old argument for the trusts. He was for the trusts last spring; he is for them again this winter. Now, it never seems to occur to the gentleman that his position about the matter is inconsistent. Consistency is waved aside when the gentleman attacks the President. Why, the gentleman from Washington is so prejudiced against Woodrow Wilson that I do not believe he would vote to indorse the Lord's Prayer if the President of the United States had indorsed it first. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from Washington has got a bad case of the shingles.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman has got a bad case of the shingles, as my friend from Georgia here says. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington says something else. He says that there are no Democrats over here who are heartily in favor of this bill. Why, the gentleman is wholly in error and, as usual, does not know what he is talking about. He says the Democrats praise President Wilson on the floor and curse him in the cloakrooms. I deny it, and say it is untrue. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not do anything of the kind. I do not know how the gentleman got into a Democratic cloakroom and found out what he claims to have found out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I walked in.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the gentleman walked in, he did not hear what he claims to have heard. Now, I want to say this: Here is a bill—

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman walked into the wrong cloakroom.

Mr. McKELLAR. As my friend suggests, the gentleman perhaps walked into the wrong cloakroom, and if he heard somebody abuse the President, it was in the Republican cloakroom.

Now, I want to say this about this matter: It is claimed that this bill has not been considered by this House. This is not true. This measure has been reported out by a committee of this House and has been considered by a committee of this House. It is in line with what the great majority of Democrats believe, is a mandate of the Democratic platform at Baltimore. It has been the policy of the Democratic Party at all times to build up and foster a merchant marine. The President of the United States is not trying to jam anything down our throats. We are working with him. He is doing just exactly what we want in urging us to pass this bill and in helping us pass it. We want a ship bill, and we want to build up the American merchant marine which you gentlemen have allowed to be destroyed by your policies during the last 50 years. We want to build it up, and the President of the United States is simply standing solidly and earnestly and vigorously with the Democratic Party in endeavoring to carry out our platform on that subject, and we respect him and admire him for his position. He is not afraid. He is not to be deterred by the obstacles which you may try to throw in the way. He is standing squarely for the Democratic Party and for the urgent needs of the country, and this House will stand with him.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman said this bill has been reported by a committee. It does not so show on its face. It says it was referred to a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, the gentleman knows perfectly well, if he knows anything about what has happened in this House, that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have reported out exactly this kind of a bill. Indeed, this very bill in substance.

Mr. PLATT. But not this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; this bill. On September 8. Of course, this is an amendment to a bill; it is different only in a parliamentary sense or a technical sense, but the very bill, substantially word for word, almost letter for letter, has been considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this House and reported to this House some time ago. The Senate committee has also substantially reported it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. This rule says the committee is discharged from the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT.]

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] has challenged those of us who disagree with the proposed measure to suggest amendments. I shall suggest two, which I believe to be fundamentally necessary if we are not to blunder into war.

These under the rule will, of course, die unconsidered, and so I shall be constrained to vote against the bill.

First. The purchase of belligerent ships should be precluded; and

Second. Federal merchant ships should not carry cargoes to belligerent nations, but should confine their services to neutral commerce and to our home and coastwise ports.

Under different conditions I should most heartily support this bill. I not only believe that it is proper and advisable for



the Federal Government to go into the shipping business, but I believe that it is especially necessary in view of the needs of the Navy. Even if we, the whole people, shall operate such ships at a loss, it is better to subsidize all of us than pay a few beneficiaries under a system of private subsidies.

We all know that we are short of auxiliary vessels for the Navy, and short of men of the right sort to man our Navy in time of war. But the world has been stricken with madness, and those who circulate in the neighborhood of the rabid can not be too careful lest they be inoculated.

When we consider the argument urged by every one of the nations at war, that each is struggling for national existence, and then total up the sum of the strife, we find that they are all valiantly struggling for national destruction and damnation—in which we desire no part.

As a Nation seeking peace, as a Nation sympathizing with the trials and struggles and the sufferings of all, it is our business to keep ourselves from even the appearance of evil.

I, for one, do not distrust the President or his Cabinet. I believe that they are acting from the highest motives and from the best light they have. But that can not in any way relieve us of the Congress from our personal responsibility. [Applause on the Republican side.] It rests with Congress to determine whether or not we shall be embroiled. It is no less incumbent upon us to prevent the first step than it is to prevent the last step into war. Each and every Member of this House has a personal duty to keep the country at peace, and each should voice that responsibility free from partisanship, conscientiously.

We are told that the bill before us is drawn along lines of international law. I have read with the greatest care the masterly utterances of authorities who differ entirely as to what constitutes international law in connection with shipping.

It is admitted that the international law as construed by different nations is at variance.

We know that international law is nothing but convention established from time to time between the nations or made to order by those most powerful on land or sea as suits their convenience. It is absurd that international law should, for instance, countenance the sale of munitions of war by the individuals of a neutral country and at the same time should consider it a violation of international law for a nation to sell such munitions of war from its own stores. The first proposition condones a crime against humanity, the latter is a feeble minimizing of an evil privilege. If only all munitions of war were manufactured by governments, international law would save all of us from the iniquity of promoting murder among friendly nations.

We are familiar with Lowell's poem, Jonathan to John, wherein John Bull is berated for selling arms to the Confederacy:

You wonder why we're hot, John?  
Your mark wuz on the guns,  
The neutral guns, that shot, John,  
Our brothers an' our sons.

I prefer to consider questions like the one before us from the standpoint of private judgment, unbiased by all these diametrically opposed and conflicting definitions. For as long as the dictionaries of international law can be published in constantly changing editions, by all nations, and when doctors of international law so violently disagree, each citizen must make his own determination, based on his judgment of what ought to be law—ought to be law, because law is supposed to be common sense.

In the bill before us we find that "no purchases shall be made in a way which shall disturb the conditions of neutrality."

If this proviso means anything, it simply means that we shall not purchase interned ships in a manner productive of discussion or trouble. This is a small meaning. If the sentence should read "no purchase shall be made or operations undertaken that shall disturb the conditions of neutrality," there would be real meaning in this proviso. To my mind, it would be far better to declare against the "purchase of any ship that is entitled to fly the flag of any nation now at war."

The ships now interned in the neutral waters of the United States would be subject to capture if they went out under their own flags. If they were to go out under our flag, there would be a close analogy to the case where a hound dog chased a rabbit into a hole and waited at the mouth of the hole, saying to himself with watering mouth, "There is my rabbit," and thereafter the rabbit emerged with an American flag wrapped around him. There might be trouble for the rabbit and the American flag might be torn. It is safer to leave belligerent ships entirely alone. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The next question is as to what the Federally owned ships shall do after they are built or purchased. The bill specifically provides that they shall engage in foreign commerce and shall

not hamper or compete with the coastwise trade. Now, whatever international law may be, we, all of us in this House, have had some experience with practical politics, and we know the vast difference that would be held by our citizens to obtain between the seizure of a privately owned ship that might be guilty of carrying contraband—and contraband varies with every nation and from day to day—at its own risk, and a Federal ship that might be seized for the same reason.

There is a vast political difference between privately owned and public-owned ships. The private shipowner may take his chances without involving the country in war, but the public ship, under Federal ownership and control, if doing what the private ship might do with nothing but the penalty of capture, would, to my mind, be extremely apt to drag us into this contest wherein the warring nations are all too willing to involve all their neighbors.

The thin disguise that a private corporation shall manage these ships and that by such fiction the Government shall secure immunity seems puerile in this day and generation. There is a continual effort born of necessity to hold those who control the management of corporations to full personal responsibility. Else why should the Rockefellers be prosecuted and persecuted for the iniquities of the war in Colorado?

Our Federal vessels should be confined to traffic with neutral countries and should engage in our own coastwise trade. They would then release coastwise vessels for foreign trade. It is absurd to contend that vessels belonging to all the people should be hampered by coastwise laws, while those belonging to privileged corporations, a few of the people and perhaps none of them our own people, shall have open to them the full privileges of our home trade. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. How much time did the gentleman use?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seven minutes. The gentleman yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that there is very little difference between Member and Member as to whether we should have a merchant marine or not.

On the other hand, I think that everybody here is agreed that the Nation ought to have a merchant marine and that instead of allowing foreign countries to carry our merchandise we ought to provide the means by which we can carry a portion of it, at least, ourselves. This bill, however, professes to be one suggestion of the manner of building up the merchant marine that I do not believe will be a success, first, because it is admitted by its sponsors to be an emergency bill, and its very character as such is that two years after the war closes the Government is to discontinue the use of the ships as a carrying or merchant agency, when they are to be taken back to the Navy Department. The Navy is permitted to sublet or to lease to merchantmen. In this way the Government builds at its own cost the ship and leases it to other corporations. I do not believe that that is a wise method. In the first place, the Government, taking all the risk in an enterprise which thus far has not proved a success financially, not only in expenditure but also in the possible contingencies that might arise with other countries through our Government owning the vessels and operating them through some sublessees, you are thus inviting complications instead of avoiding the dangers that I see in this particular plan of Government ownership. Then, again, I am not ready to change our methods and abandon private ownership for governmental ownership. I do not believe that the time is here when I am justified in taking such a long step toward national socialism as that step would be. On the other hand, I am convinced that the Government ought to encourage private enterprise and not to discourage it. I do not think the Government ought to enter into competition with private enterprise, because private enterprise certainly can not successfully compete against the Government. And instead of driving out of existence private enterprise by the strong arm of the Government, the Government ought to stimulate it. Then, again, I am opposed to the manner in which this bill has come into the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present. I think the gentleman is entitled to an audience here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five gentlemen are present—not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70.]

Abercrombia	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Rupley
Ainey	Frear	L'Engle	Sabath
Anthony	Gard	Lever	Sells
Avis	Gardner	Levy	Shreve
Barnhart	George	Lewis, Pa.	Slayden
Bartholdt	Gerry	Lindquist	Smith, Md.
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	Loft	Smith, N. Y.
Bowdle	Goeke	McClellan	Sparkman
Broussard	Goldfogle	McGillcuddy	Stafford
Brown, N. Y.	Gorman	McGuire, Okla.	Steenerson
Brown, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Summers
Browne, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Maher	Switzer
Burgess	Hamill	Martin	Talbot, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Cantrill	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mulkey	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hamlin	Murdoch	Taylor, N. Y.
Carr	Hart	Murray	Thacher
Carter	Haugen	Neeley, Kans.	Townsend
Cary	Hawley	Nelson	Treadway
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayden	Nolan, J. I.	Tribble
Clark, Fla.	Hayes	O'Brien	Tuttle
Claypool	Hensley	Oglesby	Underhill
Coady	Hobson	O'Hair	Vare
Copley	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Vollmer
Cramton	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer	Walker
Danforth	Humphreys, Miss.	Patten, N. Y.	Wallin
Dent	Jones	Peterson	Walsh
Dershem	Kahn	Platt	Walters
Dooling	Keister	Plumley	Whaley
Driscoll	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	White
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Post	Williams
Dupré	Kettner	Price	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Kinkaid	Prouty	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Kitchin	Reed	Winslow
Estopinal	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan	Woodruff
Fairchild	Kreider	Roberts, Nev.	
Falson	Langham	Rucker	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). On this call 276 Members have responded, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized for six minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, at 11 o'clock to-day we went into session. It is now 6 o'clock. We have spent 7 hours here. During that time we have had five roll calls on the question of no quorum and two roll calls on other phases of the parliamentary status and have 3 hours and 50 minutes left out of the 6 hours of general debate originally allotted. I mention that to indicate that the majority side is not interested in this legislation.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. ADAMSON. You would not have had the last roll call if the gentleman himself had not yielded the floor for that purpose.

Mr. FESS. I had to yield the floor under parliamentary law and the rules of the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was there any compulsion on the gentleman?

Mr. FESS. Yes. I was compelled on the point of order, and I had no recourse.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. FESS. The point of no quorum takes me off the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that the Democratic side of this House is not interested in this legislation. There is not any question about it. You are not in favor of it, and you are here, when you are here, simply to ratify an order that has come in from the White House. Otherwise you would stay here and not kill time in this way.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FESS. I do.

Mr. RAINEY. Does it not indicate that the House is not interested in the gentleman's speech?

Mr. FESS. Oh, that is a cheap thing for you to say. I am not the only one who is speaking from this floor. The gentleman himself will be speaking later, perhaps, and if he should speak I will have the respect to stay and listen to him if he has anything to say. [Applause.] There have been as many speeches on the Democratic side of the House as from the Republican side. But the fact is you are taking your orders from the White House, and you know you are. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Senate on the 15th day of last month began the discussion of this issue. It is still before that body. It is now by order brought over here. You listen to the order that comes from the White House and bring in a rule to close this debate here in six hours. Then you refuse to stay in the Chamber that the hours may be consumed in debate without your presence. Less than five-sixths of one minute is permitted to each Member of this House to debate this issue. Forty-nine seconds are all that you are allotting to the individual Member of the House, and yet you are discussing an issue that involves an entire change of the governmental policy of the Nation, which is neither Democratic nor Republican, so far as an issue goes; an issue that ought to take months for its discussion before you undertake to make the change. And more than that, you are undertaking to do a thing that may involve the Nation not only in national industrial disturbance but in international trouble. Every single time that a Government-owned vessel flying the American flag crosses the sea in time of war our Nation will be taking the risk of getting into trouble by violating the laws of neutrality. Suppose such a vessel were seized by a foreign country, what would be the consequence? And yet, with but five-sixths of one minute allotted to the individual Member to discuss this great issue, involving national and international complications, you refuse to remain here to make a quorum, because it is all done, anyway, by Executive order. There is not a Member in this House, Republican or Democrat, that does not know that the order is given, and it will be carried out just as it is given.

It seems to me that this House of Representatives, with 435 Members, is in a peculiar situation, if its membership will receive orders from the White House to ratify simply what the occupant of the White House says. That is precisely the situation here. You condemn it privately, but you do not dare to do it publicly. I do not blame you for not doing it publicly. But there is not a Member on this side of the House, as there is not on that side, but knows that we ought not to push a measure like this through this House in six hours with scarcely any discussion at all, and when men on the floor are asking to be heard in the debate, you do not even have interest to stay here to listen, and the excuse is given that the men who speak have not anything to say that is worth hearing. That may be your standard of legislation, but I want to say to you that it is rather the measure of Executive influence over this House. It is also the measure of the weakness of the American Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I want to say that I have not been directed by the White House or anybody else to support this bill. I am going to support this bill without any direction from anybody.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to hear it. The gentleman has shown his independence on other occasions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe anybody on this side has had instructions from anybody to vote for this bill. I think the gentleman from Ohio makes a misstatement when he says that this side has been directed to vote for this bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman because I wanted to be courteous to him. But that does not change the situation after all. I said a moment ago that it was not the measure of the strength of the executive department, but it is the measure of the weakness of the legislative department; and I repeat that statement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The time has come when the legislative body ought to speak on matters of legislation, and not have orders sent down to put a thing through and rush it without further debate than six hours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] will permit, I would like to yield a little time which I have reserved. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the discourse to which we have just listened from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], which might be more appropriately termed a scolding than an address, is, of course, very interesting. We have heard here to-day, and we hear frequently on the part of Members of the opposition, the fact that men on this side have not sufficient



courage to vote their own convictions because they are dictated to from the White House. So far as I am individually concerned, I deny that charge, and on behalf of my Democratic friends I deny it for them. I say for myself that if this proposition were put up to the American Congress by a Republican administration, by a Republican President, believing in it as I do as a safe measure, I would have what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] does not possess—patriotism and courage enough to vote for it, regardless of where it comes from. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the progress of this debate I have heard much from gentlemen who oppose the bill about embarking this Government in Government ownership and "State socialism." If this sophistry affords them a convenient argument against coming to the relief of the people in this great emergency, I shall be the last to rob them of the effect of its soothing qualities.

However, I desire to call attention to a serious condition which confronts the people of this Nation, and which may grow more serious as this great war progresses. I am not frightened, Mr. Speaker, by the specter of "Government ownership," which has been raised to becloud the issue in this contest. I do not propose on this occasion to be beguiled into a desertion of my plain duty by following or adopting old worn-out political aphorisms, which were perhaps applicable to another generation and to other conditions, but which have no place and no value in the solution of this and many other modern questions with which we have to deal.

Let us face conditions as they are now, and not rattle around among the dead bones of ancient heroes while our people suffer and are robbed. The greatest war in history is now in progress. The avenues of trade and the means of transportation upon the high seas have been interrupted. Freight rates upon the ocean have been increased from 300 to 1,100 per cent, and upon many commodities the rates are absolutely prohibitive, even if ships could be secured. We are at the mercy of a foreign Shipping Trust. There can be no question about that. Less than 8 per cent of our foreign commerce is carried by ships flying the American flag. The balance is carried by foreign ships. This foreign shipping monopoly has increased the freight rates upon American cotton from \$1.25 per bale to \$15 and \$18 per bale. It has increased the rate for the shipment of lumber to such an extent that no man can afford to ship it at all, and many of our lumber mills have been compelled to close down and throw men out of employment because they can not secure ships to carry lumber; and if they could, the rates are so high as to make shipment at a profit out of the question.

This foreign shipping monopoly has increased the freight rate on Kentucky export tobacco from 30 cents per hundred pounds to \$3.40 and \$4 per hundred pounds, and ships are so scarce and rates so high that many foreign buyers have cabled their agents in this country to stop buying. These foreign ship-owners have canceled contracts with American shippers running for a year without notice, and have compelled them to pay outrageous increases in freight or let their products rot upon the shores. They have arbitrarily refused to carry some commodities in order to have more room for others upon which they could charge higher rates.

Mr. Speaker, this condition of affairs has been especially hurtful to the farmers of Kentucky. Our great money crop, especially in the western part of the State, is dark tobacco, 85 per cent of which is exported to Europe. The prices which have been received by the farmers for that product in the last few years have ranged around \$8 and \$10 per hundred for the best grades, with smaller prices for lower grades. It was expected that the European war would to some extent affect the price of tobacco to the farmer, and this expectation has been fearfully fulfilled. But when it is contemplated that in addition to this unfavorable market condition a foreign shipping monopoly, flying other flags than ours, has arbitrarily raised the freight upon that tobacco from 30 cents per hundred to \$3.40 per hundred, which increase must in the long run come largely from the farmer's pocket because of the decrease in the price which he may receive, some idea may be obtained of the unhappy conditions which must prevail if that condition is permitted to continue.

These same conditions prevail, with varying degrees, with respect to everything the American people have to ship. The American people have a surplus every year of both farm products and manufactured products. That surplus they have a right to sell in the markets of the world wherever it is needed to administer to the wants of humanity. In this great crisis a great emergency calls for action. The markets of the world yearn for our surplus products. Shall we sit with folded hands and complacent consciences and say this great Government has no remedy to offer to her people? [Applause.]

It is not surprising that the Republican Members of Congress are against this measure. They do not want prosperity to come to the people. They would rather see the whole country in want than for this Democratic administration or the Democratic Party to get any credit for relieving a distressing situation. They would rather see the whole country on its way to perdition in a hand basket than to see tranquillity, peace, and prosperity under a Democratic administration. For 50 years they had an opportunity to build up an American merchant marine under the Constitution. Did they do it? Did they attempt it? Only by proposing to take the money of the people collected in taxes and give it graciously to a shipping trust in the form of a subsidy. In the opinion of these Republicans it is a crime, if not treason itself, to take the people's money and buy some ships to be operated by the people's Government for their relief in a great emergency; but it is the quadrupled quintessence of Republican statesmanship to take that same money and give it to a shipping trust for its private benefit without return to the Government. [Applause.]

We have heard the great constitutional and international lawyer and world-renowned diplomat from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] discuss this question from the standpoint of constitutional and international law. [Laughter.]

We need not stop now to discuss the constitutional questions involved in this measure. Under the Constitution this Nation has spent its money to improve rivers and harbors in order that the commerce of America might move. Does that same instrument deny us the right also to spend some of our money to make those rivers and harbors available and valuable in a great emergency such as that which confronts us now? Under the Constitution we have spent our money to reclaim the arid lands of the West in order to make more homes for farmers. Does that instrument deny us the right to purchase ships in a great emergency in order that this farmer may find a market for his produce? Under the Constitution we have spent our money to make the soil more fertile in every State and to make two blades of grass grow instead of one. Does that instrument deny us the right to afford to the farmers of the Nation in a great emergency reasonable facilities for transporting that surplus produce to the markets of the world? Under the Constitution we have sent consuls and American agents to all the civilized nations of the world to build up and foster American trade in those countries. Shall that instrument be now invoked against our effort to provide at least temporary facilities for the transportation of the commerce thus secured? Under the Constitution we have established the parcel post for the cheap transportation of products upon land; we have regulated the rates that may be charged by railroads and other common carriers upon the land; and under the Constitution we have done a vast number of things that the Government could do for the benefit of all the people that could or would not have been done by private enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, if the rates for hauling freight over the railroads of the United States had been in the last six months raised in the same proportion as they have upon the high seas, the American people would rise up without exception and demand that their Government come to their relief. It so happens that we can regulate and control, and have regulated and controlled, the rates at which our products may be hauled upon the land. But we have no such power to control the rates charged upon the high seas, because most of the ships are foreign and our jurisdiction only extends three miles from shore. Consequently, the only remedy that is left to us in this emergency, which will grow greater as this great war continues, is to pass this bill and let the Government purchase and operate these vessels for the benefit of all the people, farmers, manufacturers, and merchants alike, and after the war is over and the emergency is passed we shall have more time to discuss intelligently and dispassionately the permanent policy which we shall adopt in the future in order to build up a strong and permanent American merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

For the present the town is on fire, and it does not behoove us as intelligent men to stand under a sycamore tree and discuss the question whether it would be wise at some time in the future to put in waterworks and a fire department, while all the time the town is burning. Let us grab the buckets, go to the nearest and most available source of water, and put out the fire. The settlement of future policies and programs can well await the day when the rebuilding shall begin. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, several times this afternoon I have noticed the use of a phrase like the one used by the gentle-



man from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who just took his seat, referring to the preservation of the neutrality of the United States. In section 7 of this bill we find as the concluding paragraph these words:

*Provided further, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.*

It seems to me that neither the declarations made on the floor of the House that neutrality will not be disturbed nor the provision in this bill to the same effect touch the real point of international difficulty. It is conceivable, but not very likely, that in the purchase of ships owned by belligerents the transaction might in some way compromise the neutrality of the United States. For example, the question of neutrality might be raised concerning the shipment of money to pay for those vessels. Money is contraband, just as gunpowder is contraband; but, to my mind, this is not the point upon which an international dispute is most likely to arise. No declaration that the United States Government will preserve its neutrality touches the real danger of the bill. We could buy those ships, private persons could buy them, or perhaps even the Government itself could buy them, without raising any question of having committed an unneutral act. The real point is this: If the declaration of London is in force—and it is in force in English law—we buy ships that under British law, under French law, under German law, under Russian law, and under Italian law are subject to capture. It is not a question of the neutrality of the United States; it is a matter of buying property to which we can acquire only a clouded title.

The provision that forbids any purchase which would compromise the neutrality of the United States does not cover the case. We buy the property, but there is a doubt whether the owner could convey a clear title. The German owner of a ship lying idle in a harbor of the United States will remain the owner of it so long as it does not go outside of the 3-mile limit. When it sails the ocean as a German vessel any warship of an enemy of Germany has, under international law, the unquestioned right to capture it, merely because it is enemy property.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I understand the gentleman states the proposition that a German-owned ship lying in American waters is the private property of that German, and that as long as it is in the waters of the United States, owned by him, he could sell that ship.

Mr. TEMPLE. I did not say that he had a right to sell it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Does the gentleman say that the German citizen who owned a German ship lying in American waters could not sell that ship in good faith?

Mr. TEMPLE. If the gentleman will give me my time, I will make a speech on that subject. That is the topic that I am going to talk about. The question will not hold me any closer to the point than I would hold myself.

The whole question is whether the German owner of that ship can sell us property that will not be subject to capture. He can sell us all he owns, but if he sails it on the ocean it will be captured. If we buy it from him, we have to prove, in the language of the declaration of London, that it was not sold "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy ship as such is exposed." If we can not prove this, the transfer of the vessel to the American flag is void.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman allow me to interpose a question?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. I have seen it stated in some of the speeches in the Senate that the declaration of London has never been ratified by England, either by treaty or otherwise, and that the only law in force in England is a law that is 200 years old.

Mr. TEMPLE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the declaration of London is in force in English courts. I exhibited here a week ago last Saturday an order in council and a royal proclamation, dated October 29, 1914, in which the King in council instructed all the judges of the prize courts to enforce the provisions of the declaration of London.

Mr. WEBB. Did not a commission report to—

Mr. TEMPLE. I can not yield longer nor go back further than the order in council. The point I make is that on October 29, 1914, an order in council was issued instructing the judges of the prize courts to put the London declaration into effect. The report to which you refer is of an earlier date than that, and no law earlier than that date can by any possibility supersede the later one.

Germany, Italy, France, and Russia have also put that law into effect. Now, when a case is tried, suppose a German ship

is transferred to the American flag and captured by an English cruiser; it will be tried in an English court, not in an American court. If it is captured by a French cruiser, it will be tried in a French court.

A case arose in 1912 in which article 47 of the London declaration was involved, in a dispute between Italy and France during the late war between Italy and Turkey. Italy was enforcing the declaration of London, and France protested against it. They agreed to take the case to the court of arbitration at The Hague. The ruling of the court will be found in the report on the case of the *Manouba*, in the American Journal of International Law for July, 1913. The Hague Court of Arbitration gave its award in accordance with article 47 of the declaration of London, when neither Italy nor France had ratified that document. England has announced her intention to enforce it; we may protest. Italy had announced her intention to enforce it, and France had protested; and yet, when it went to the international court of arbitration at The Hague, that court sustained article 47 of the declaration of London. The powers that signed the declaration had agreed that the rules contained in it correspond, in substance, with the generally recognized principles of international law. I think we ought to avoid a controversy that is already practically decided against us. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who may speak upon this bill may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, and several others objected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-nine Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71.]

Alney	Finley	Langham	Riordan
Allen	Fitzgerald	Langley	Roberts, Mass.
Anthony	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Roberts, Nev.
Ashbrook	Fordney	L'Engle	Rothermel
Austin	Fowler	Lever	Rupley
Avis	Francis	Levy	Sabath
Barnhart	Frear	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Bartholdt	Gard	Lindquist	Seldomridge
Bartlett	George	Loft	Sells
Bathrick	Gerry	McClellan	Sherley
Borland	Gillmore	McGillcuddy	Shreve
Bowdle	Gittins	McGuire, Okla.	Slayden
Broussard	Godwin	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Brown, W. Va.	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	Mahan	Smith, Saml. W.
Bulkeley	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Green, Iowa	Manahan	Sparkman
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	Martin	Stafford
Callaway	Hamill	Mondell	Steenerson
Campbell	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore	Switzer
Cantrill	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, La.	Talbot, Md.
Carew	Harrison	Morrison	Tavener
Carr	Hart	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ala.
Carter	Haugen	Mott	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Hawley	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Nelson	Thacher
Clark, Fla.	Helgesen	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson, Okla.
Claypool	Helvering	Norton	Towner
Cline	Henry	O'Brien	Townsend
Coady	Hensley	Oglesby	Treadway
Copley	Hobson	O'Shaunessy	Tuttle
Cramton	Hoxworth	Paige, Mass.	Underhill
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Vare
Davenport	Humphreys, Miss.	Peters	Walker
Davis	Johnson, S. C.	Peterson	Wallin
Dent	Jones	Platt	Walsh
Dershem	Kahn	Plumley	Walters
Doolling	Kelster	Pou	Wilson, Fla.
Drukker	Kelley, Mich.	Price	Wilson, N. Y.
Dunn	Kettner	Prouty	Winslow
Edwards	Kless	Rainey	Woodruff
Elder	Kitchin	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Fairchild	Knowland, J. R.	Rayburn	
Faison	Korby	Reed	
Ferris	Kreider	Reilly, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 245 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 75, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a trifle disconcerting to one who has a splendid speech to deliver to an expectant audience—or, at least, one that he hopes is expectant—to find while the roll is being called that the Members answer to their names and then immediately run as though they were trying to escape from the scene of their crimes. [Laughter.] I do not suppose, however, it is becoming in any of us to make complaint. By this time we ought to be used to any sort of treatment in the House. I think it is about all we deserve, and we may as well be satisfied, because I am sure it is all we are going to get. We have before us a bill that has never been considered by a committee of the House, that has never been passed upon by a committee of the House; one that is brought in here and one we are told to pass without the opportunity of considering it or of offering a single amendment to it. Not only that, but we have had added to it another measure, widely divergent in its subject matter and of transcendent importance to the American people. Both of these bills are of that importance, and yet we are, after a few hours of useless and almost absurd general debate, to vote upon them. You may pass this measure in this manner, if you like, but when you leave this Chamber, no matter what the hour may be, do not raise your heads in pride and say that you have this day labored in the greatest legislative body in the world. You have not labored in a legislative body at all. Do you know, my friends, that in every civilized nation in the world the legislative body of the people, the body that immediately represents the people, has been gaining in power at the expense of the other departments of the Government, save in our own?

The House of Commons has become the great ruling power of England; likewise the Chamber of Deputies in France, drawn from and immediately representing the people of France, is the great lawmaking, controlling body in that great country; likewise is this true in Italy, in Germany, aye, in Japan. But in the United States, where we claim free institutions were first given their real life, the people's body, the House of Representatives, has been rapidly declining in importance and in power until now its ancient glory is all but vanished. We have ceased to be an important factor in our scheme of government. The functions of this great branch, the lawmaking body designed to represent the will and protect the rights of the people, have been of late rapidly assumed by the Senate and the Executive. The House of Representatives as it stands to-day is an unnecessary and at times an inconvenient body—unnecessary because it has surrendered its power and performs no vital function, inconvenient because a slight obstacle that must be stepped on by the ever-growing Senate and Executive. This House is of about as much use to the Government of the United States to-day as the appendix is to the human frame, and no more. You are making history. You bring in a transcendently important matter of this kind and force its passage through this body, supposed directly to represent the people, without giving the people's representatives the slightest opportunity to shape it, frame it, or consider it. You make a farce, a complete farce, of this, the designed to be most important branch of the National Legislature.

You are making history. Yes; but history that you and your children and your children's children will be ashamed of during all the ages to come. You are reversing the processes fundamental in the evolution of free institutions and putting into action the forces that lead to absolutism.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the brethren who are so terribly and deeply interested in this bill for just a moment, I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the things in the bill.

I wish I had time to call attention to many of the things, for it seems to me that the merits of the bill have not as yet attracted the attention of the Members of the House. Probably it is because we have not time to consider its merits or demerits, and for the further reason that it does not matter what the merits or defects are, anyway, for you are going to vote it through and make a wry face when you do the job. This bill is quite in harmony in its subject matter with the method of its presentation and passage. It is an inglorious surrender as a lawmaking body, representing the people of the United States, of some of the fundamental things intrusted to this body under

our Government. This is the lawmaking part or at least a portion of the lawmaking part of our Government, and yet in two sections we propose to turn over to the Executive of the Nation the right to amend and repeal all the rules and regulations under the law that exist to-day for the control of our merchant marine, and to replace them with any other rules and regulations it may please his omnipotent power to import. No such power as that was ever given by a free people to a tyrant, except in the way you are giving this under the lash of the tyrant's whip.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I have only a moment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I just want to puncture that error there.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can puncture later on in his own time, but he will find no error there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman were informed, he would not make such a statement.

Mr. MILLER. I have read the gentleman's bill, and I am giving it almost literally. The gentleman himself apparently does not know what is in the bill, and I do not wonder at it. I have not discovered anyone on that side of the House who pretends to understand what is in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. MILLER. One thing further. I notice in section 7 there is an apt and fitting expression of the attitude of this sycophantic, this cringing, this beseeching body of the people's representatives. It reads:

That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels.

What a grand and glorious moment! The United States of America, whenever a grand and glorious President, clothed with his omnipotent power, graciously condescends to permit, these United States may purchase a ship! The United States can purchase a boat when the President of the United States says that it may. How does that comport with Democratic doctrine since the days of Thomas Jefferson?

Nay, more, Mr. Speaker; I observe some more things in this bill that attract the passing attention. We have not time to give any more than passing attention to the bill, but let us give that. I see that it provides that the corporation stock and the property of the corporation which it is proposed the corporation shall acquire shall be exempt from taxation. I suppose that is upon the theory that it is the property of the United States and ought not as such to be taxed. All well and good, so far as that goes, but the bill contemplates that private individuals will become subscribers to the capital stock of this \$10,000,000 corporation up to 49 per cent, and if they do they will become the owners of almost half the property owned; and what right have you to absolve that property from paying its just share of taxes that are being paid to-day by all other property in America?

Then I notice one thing further. You say that while the United States, through its Executive and the board, is to control the corporation, because it is to have 51 per cent of the stock of the corporation, in the same breath you write into the bill a provision that a majority of the stockholders—not the stock, but a majority of the stockholders—can remove every officer of the corporation, and remove thereby the United States Government itself from the control of its own property. Then another thing. It is proposed to issue \$40,000,000 worth of Panama Canal bonds to finance this project. What a gulp of American pride you swallow when you do this. In the days of our country's prosperity—Republican days; good, old Republican days—our country carried through the stupendous achievement of constructing this great aid to commerce and national defense, engineered it, and financed it almost entirely out of the current revenues of our prosperous country. Now that you have destroyed our country's prosperity, exhausted her Treasury, burdened her people with every conceivable form of taxation, you propose to reach back, lay violent hands upon the glory of the past, and rob former success to pay for this extravagant foolishness, to enter upon a career industrially vicious and fraught with grave danger to our national peace. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand between the two sides?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has an hour and thirty-four minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 hour and 24 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has 20 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I trust gentlemen on that side will use a little time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].



Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago when the question of tolls through the Panama Canal were up for consideration some of the Members of this House were ready and eager to repeat the story of the young American eagle when it lined its nest in the lion's mane, and now it seems that they are so afraid of England or of the thought of possible controversy that they are scared into conniption fits at the very flare of the lion's tail much less his mane. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The position they take reminds me a little bit, when gentlemen proceed to talk about the prospects of war, of the little story my father used to tell about a Georgia captain, and he had the right to talk about a Georgia captain because he was a Louisiana captain. He said during the war that there was a Georgia captain who had his troops along a certain defense, and he said to his troops, "Boys, there are only a few of us and our ammunition is short. We are hungry and tired. The Yankees have four companies and they have plenty of ammunition; they are well fed, and they are coming here presently. My orders to you are to fire three or four rounds and then run. I am a little lame and I will start now." [Applause.] That is the position these gentlemen take when we take this useless Weeks bill and put into it something that will do business. They say that the London convention has prohibited us from buying vessels. The fact of the matter is that such a prohibition has never been incorporated in any international agreement or convention in the history of this world. Never before has it been claimed with any color of authority that the American Government did not have a right to buy interned ships of a belligerent in a neutral port if we desired to do so, and never before has our procedure on that line been questioned.

England has taken our ships away from us; she has taken our merchant marine from us when we were engaged in war and no question was raised; England has taken such ships repeatedly from other nations at war. They say that the London convention, composed of delegates of the various nations, prohibits us from buying these ships; but what are the facts? The facts of the matter are that the various nations gave their suggestions to the London convention called to compile the rules of international law and, in reference to this matter, said that under international law only the matter of good faith was involved in such transfers; that any neutral nation could buy interned ships of belligerents if good faith existed in the matter of the purchase. And then, after they got through with the London convention, the managers for England reported on what was done at that convention. Here is a report made to the British Government:

The provisions respecting transfers made during a war are less complicated. The general rule is that such transfers are considered void unless it be proved that they were not made with a view to evade the consequences which the retention of enemy nationality during war would entail. This is only another way of stating the principle already explained that transfers effected after the outbreak of hostilities are good if made bona fide, but that it is for the owners of the vessels transferred to prove such bona fides.

In other words, they reported a rule restating exactly what has always been stated before, and at the outbreak of hostilities England issued an order, Germany issued a lot of orders, and the United States has issued an order; and they say that the English order is going to be enforced absolutely, because England has the courts, because England will take our ships into the jurisdiction of the English courts, and that of course the English courts will do as England makes them. The English law, if it is international law, does not get its power from the London convention, because it is admitted that it has not been adopted; but it gets its power and force from the order issued by the Admiralty, by the British Government. Well, now, our Secretary of State issued an order to the contrary. He said officially that the London convention is not binding. Germany issued an order the other day telling us that they had a right to create a war zone around the British Isles, and I suppose we have got to assume as true whatever the German Government says; if the German courts can get hold of a vessel in that area such will rule according to whatever the German Kaiser says. There is no truth in these contentions. The court will have to decide according to international law—not governmental orders—subject to arbitration if the Government is dissatisfied with the court's finding.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Give me two minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. BRYAN. There has been one other argument made here in reference to contraband. It is said that the Government entering into this shipping will get into trouble over contraband or that we can not carry contraband goods. Well, of course the Government of the United States will know what goes into a ves-

sel of its own; the Government of the United States will be careful about what kind of goods it carries, and we can carry some legitimate commerce across the seas. It will no longer be the case that lumber and noncontraband articles can not be carried, because they can not afford to pay the tremendous freight rates that are charged on munitions of war and contraband articles. We will get across the ocean some legitimate commerce, some of the things that the people of this country want to continue their trade in, and some things that they ought to continue their trade in, and they will not bring protests from all sections of the country because contraband is being taken. The United States Government will know what is carried in all the ships, and that is one of the arguments in behalf of the Government going into legitimate, straightforward business, and business that amounts to something.

We have met three or four emergencies at this session of Congress, and it gives me the keenest kind of delight to see us go to Government ownership in things of this kind. It is known that I believe in Government ownership of all the means of interstate commerce in this country. I am glad enough to see you accept that remedy. It gratifies me to see you get to the real thing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rule because I was opposed to such a drastic and unnecessary restriction upon debate and the right to offer amendments. But I shall vote for the bill, because I am heartily and entirely in favor of it. This bill, Mr. Speaker, not only will do something to meet the present emergency, but it will do something to start a real American merchant marine. I think every man here admits that the people of the United States ought to have their own merchant marine. Private capital has not gone into that business in the last 60 years. There are only three possible ways in which you can build up an American merchant marine. First, you might repeal all the navigation laws and all the ship-registry laws; but that will never be done, and I do not think it ought to be done, because a large part of those laws were passed for the purpose of protecting life at sea and protecting sailors at sea, and the sentiment in this country will not stand for a repeal of those humanitarian regulations. Then you have left only two other ways in which you can build up the merchant marine. One is to grant a subsidy to private corporations. That has been against Democratic policy, and I do not believe we will ever have that law in this country. The only other method that remains is for the Government to go into the business directly itself, which is the proper, democratic, and legitimate way. The Government will then have absolute control of rates and service and everything connected with the merchant marine. If we grant a subsidy to private corporations we still would have no opportunity to control transportation rates upon the seas. If we own the ships we can fix our own rates and our own service. For these reasons I am in favor of this bill.

Now, just a word about the international aspects. The strongest speech made here to-day in opposition to this bill was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. This statement of the law was clear and convincing, but his assumption of what the facts are going to be was entirely unfounded and unreasonable. To carry contraband would violate neutrality, but every man knows that these ships will not carry contraband. While I would be glad to see an amendment put in this bill stating specifically that these ships shall not carry contraband, that amendment would not make it any surer or any clearer than it is that these ships will never carry contraband goods. No administration having full control of these ships and of the cargoes that go into them would ever for a moment consider shipping contraband goods. So there is no danger from that source.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the gentleman's position then that if England had declared all foodstuffs destined for Germany contraband, these ships would not carry any foodstuffs to Germany?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Yes, sir; it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire yields back one minute.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, this proposition is one in which I am very much interested. In the Democratic caucus I offered two amendments to this bill which I should have liked very much to have adopted. I voted against the previous question.



I wanted to offer those amendments here. I am unalterably opposed to the coastwise ship monopoly, and would be willing to make almost any sacrifice of any opinion I might have in reference to ships, in order that we might be able to break up such monopoly. [Applause.] Now, I should like—

Mr. MURDOCK. By the way, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. The terms of this bill, as I read them, absolutely exclude these ships from participation in coastwise traffic.

Mr. Sisson. Unless they are American ships. In other words, the United States Government under this bill could have an American-built ship engage in the coastwise trade just as an American citizen could. But I thought this was a great opportunity to put in this bill a provision that the ships that might be purchased or built by the United States Government might be able to get a cargo made up from several ports in the United States for the foreign trade or hauling freight from one port to another. Therefore, I offered amendments in the caucus for the purpose of accomplishing that result. In order that I might be able to offer that amendment in the House, I voted against the previous question. There are some features of the bill I do not like.

If I had the writing of the bill, I would strike some of the features out of it. There are others that I would put in the bill. But on the final passage of the bill I am going to vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My principal reason for doing so is this: If the Government shall go into the shipping business during this emergency and shall continue in the shipping business until the people can realize that the Government is excluded from doing business in her own ports from port to port in a ship which the Government has built on the Clyde, I do not believe that the masses of the American people will stand much longer for this iniquitous coastwise monopoly. And if we can by any means get the American people aroused to the extent that they are willing to demand of Congress that you shall give the people of the United States the right to buy their ships where and when they please and put them in the coastwise trade, then we will have accomplished a great deal by this legislation.

An illustration of the wickedness of the rates of this monopoly which the American people are now paying is illustrated in coal for the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy, in a statement which he made some time ago, stated that he was giving the contracts to foreign ships to haul coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coaling stations, and that in some cases when he would get a quotation of the rates from the coastwise monopoly it would be \$8 a ton around the Horn, and the foreign shipowners carried the coal for him at \$4 a ton.

Now, he is violating the law when he does that, but they dare not prosecute the Secretary of the Navy. They dare not institute against him proceedings that would bring before the American people this great iniquity. And if we could get the people to thoroughly understand the enormous prices which they are paying for the coastwise shipping, joined as it is with the railroads of the country, which own, perhaps, the majority of all the ships, they would realize the situation as it is. The Standard Oil Co., the Beef Trust, the Fruit Trust, and the Steel Trust all own coastwise shipping; and if I could break that up in any way I would make all sorts of sacrifices to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentlemen on that side have lots of time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to conclude in one speech.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I will make the point of no quorum, so that Members may be notified of the opportunity to speak, and so be present.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] moves a call of the House. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72.]

Aiken	Fairchild	Kreider	Rupley
Alney	Falson	Lafferty	Sabath
Anthony	Falconer	Langley	Scully
Austin	Fields	Lazaro	Seldomridge
Avis	Flood	Lee, Ga.	Sells
Barnhart	Fordney	L'Engle	Sherwood
Bartholdt	Fowler	Lewis, Pa.	Shreve
Blackmon	Frear	Loft	Smith, Minn.
Borland	Gard	McClellan	Sparkman
Bowdle	Gerry	McGillcuddy	Steenerson
Britten	Gillett	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Broussard	Gittins	McLaughlin	Taggart
Brown, W. Va.	Glass	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Godwin, N. C.	Manahan	Taylor, Ala.
Bulkley	Goldfogle	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Burgess	Gorman	Morgan, La.	Taylor, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Morin	Thacher
Calder	Griest	Mott	Towner
Callaway	Guernsey	Mulkey	Treadway
Carew	Hamill	Neeley, Kans.	Tuttle
Carr	Hamilton, N. Y.	Neely, W. Va.	Underhill
Carter	Hart	Nelson	Underwood
Cary	Hawley	Nolan, J. I.	Vare
Chandler	Hayes	O'Brien	Volstead
Church	Helgesen	Oglesby	Walker
Copley	Hinds	O'Shaunessy	Wallin
Danforth	Hobson	Paige, Mass.	Walters
Davis	Howell	Palmer	Watkins
Dent	Hoxworth	Parker, N. Y.	Weaver
Dooling	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Whaley
Doolittle	Johnson, S. C.	Plumley	Whitacre
Driscoll	Jones	Price	White
Drukker	Kahn	Prouty	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keister	Reed	Wilson, N. Y.
Dupré	Kettner	Riordan	Winslow
Edwards	Kless, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.	Woodruff
Elder	Knowland, J. R.	Roberts, Nev.	Woods

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 276 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in common with other members of the Progressive Party in the House I find myself upon this measure in exactly the same situation in which we have found ourselves on many other vital measures that this Congress has considered. We discover that we are committed in favor of the name that is attached to the legislation, and in many cases to a great deal of the substance in the legislation that is offered for passage. And as most of us generally have on the progressive measures that the Democratic administration have offered found ourselves able to vote for the measure, so I expect to vote for this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I should have liked, as many Progressives on this floor would have liked, a chance to amend the bill and an opportunity as well to have debated the bill at some greater length than is permitted by this rule.

I would like the Democrats of the House to understand, if they can, something of the position in which the members of the Progressive Party have found themselves during this Congress. I would like the Democrats particularly to understand this, because they are the special beneficiaries of the existence of the Progressive Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Democrats have not shown any disposition to realize that, as far as I can see. [Laughter.] Instead of extending any helping hand to the Progressives in this Congress they have been content always to accept our help grudgingly and reluctantly, and upon the whole have played second fiddle to the stand-pat Republicans in exhibiting wholesale contempt for us as a party. [Laughter.] In the name of political consistency, I would like to know if the Democrats have not about realized by this time that their hope of continued political existence remains in the Progressive people of this country? They will not get anything by an appeal to the reactionary element in the country, because that is owned and controlled, and always will be, by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I say, our position here has been made so uncomfortable, we have been so lonely that we have felt ourselves, as far as our position here is concerned, Ishmaelites indeed; and is it any wonder that some members of our party here, under the strain and stress of this condition in which they have been placed, have become somewhat crazed, and in their delirium have actually returned to the camp of the standpatters, in the idea that they are returning to friends! [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Does not the gentleman realize that the Democrats were friendly to him personally in his contest?



Mr. MACDONALD. I do; but I am not talking personally. I am talking of a party matter.

Mr. O'HAIR. You got only what you were entitled to.

Mr. MACDONALD. In regard to this present bill, I think that is a very important alignment, along progressive lines. We find the reactionary element in the Republican Party without exception opposed to this legislation. Many of them are opposed to it because they say that it involves Government ownership. Strange to say, some others are honestly opposed to it because they believe it does not mean Government ownership. But it does to some extent mean Government ownership.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Metz] unknowingly disclosed a very peculiar frame of mind. He said, "I am opposed to Government ownership. 'Government ownership is a fad,' a temporary thing, something that is 'simply the whim of a moment'; but we are confronted by a condition that renders it necessary now to take this step, although it may seem to involve Government ownership."

That is just the point exactly. The Government, in view of the world condition with which we find ourselves confronted, is forced, for the sake of protecting itself and the people, to adopt these methods. If this were a measure presented here for the benefit of some large private interest we would have gentlemen on the Republican side, as I have heard them many times before, standing here urging us in the name of the good people to forget partisanship and hold up the hands of the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, there is no condition of which I can conceive, threatened war or anything else, that would involve a more grave situation in regard to the welfare of the American people than we are confronted with to-day. The world is at war. It is tearing loose from all its old moorings and ideas; and if we are to maintain our position in the world, if we are to give our people the things to which they are entitled, if we are to maintain the great place in the sun that the American people have made for themselves, it seems to me that now above all other times is the time to forget partisanship, the time to forget the chance that men may have for the return to the political fleshpots again, and to stand by the President in this legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Because, while the President may be the captain of the team, while he may be the leader of one of the political parties of this country, I am satisfied that he and his Cabinet advisers know that there are conditions existing that require this measure to be passed for the benefit of the whole American people, and I do not believe there is a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that that is true. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, in regard to this question of war. Under other conditions we have heard the President charged with being cowardly, supine, afraid to assert American rights, afraid to protect American citizens in Mexico through a cowardly fear of war. I do not believe the President or his advisers have changed their attitude in regard to peace since that time, and I think it is perfectly safe to leave that question to them. In any event, we as a Nation can not get off the earth. We can not sacrifice our rights and our duties as a Nation and as a people and supinely lie down in the face of world-wide conditions that we must meet. Without imputing wrong motives to gentlemen who differ with us upon this subject, it seems to me that those who advance this war scare are simply putting up a bugaboo of war for the purpose of justifying an opposition to the bill which is in reality based upon other reasons. I mean to say I do not question the motives of other gentlemen, but it seems to me that those who argue that this means a declaration of war are using that as an argument for lack of a better. They are carried away by their partisan zeal and their desire to defeat this legislation. They allow themselves to be led into a belief in an argument that is not a real argument at all. We are not likely to have war by reason of the Government being in charge of these ships. The Government is less likely to ship contraband articles than a private owner of ships would be. And I am sure that the ships that are purchased and used under this bill will be used for no other purpose than the necessary purpose of serving the commerce of the Nation that can be served without involving us in war. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, as one of the Progressives in this House, I am against this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Because I do not consider it a progressive measure and because I do not

consider it as presented to us in a progressive way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I do not know whether my good friend from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] in stating, as he did, the position of the Progressives in the House, intended to speak for all of us, but he certainly did not set forth my position on this proposition that is before us to-night.

For my part I can not see how it can be considered a progressive or proper way of legislating to come into this House, after a month or six weeks of discussion in the Senate over a bill of such importance as this, and move to discharge a committee from the consideration of another bill—the Weeks bill—and tack this ship-purchase bill on to that other bill when the ship-purchase bill has not even been introduced in the House or considered by a committee or reported to the House, and then to bring it in here under a rule limiting debate to six hours and have this new legislation provide that this vehicle—the Weeks bill—shall not go into effect for a certain length of time and that the new proposition—the ship-purchase bill—shall go into effect immediately. That seems to me to be the most reactionary way of legislating I can possibly conceive of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If you wanted to legislate decently and in order why did you Democrats not introduce the ship-purchase bill into the House, refer it to a committee, have that committee consider it and report it back to the House, and then give us a reasonable chance to debate it. A minority has a right to a reasonable opportunity to be heard on legislation, and I believe that progressive methods of legislating would give that right to the minority, and they are not given it by this rule. It seems to me that the only effect of this bill will be to use, what my friend from Kentucky described as a mere bagatelle, \$40,000,000 of public funds to buy ships that can only have one destination, and that is confiscation in a prize court. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My colleague, Dr. TEMPLE, quoted decisions here on the floor which nobody has attempted to answer, which prove that if we purchase these ships now in belligerent ownership and attempt to operate them, they will be seized and sent into a prize court, and under these precedents there can be only one decision in those courts, and that is one adverse to our interests. Certainly you must have your eyes on the purchase of these ships. All the others are already engaged in carrying cargoes abroad. As Dr. TEMPLE pointed out, the owner of a German ship now tied up in one of our ports can only convey a title to that ship subject to the same restrictions that he himself would be subject to in operating the ship. He has shown that these restrictions involve the seizure of the ship, and the trial of the question as to whether or not it should be confiscated in a foreign prize court, and under the decisions that he cited we would suffer an adverse decision.

As I said in the beginning, the whole bill impresses me as not being progressive legislation, and the way in which it is presented to us as reactionary as we could possibly imagine. Therefore I shall vote against the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were 71 ayes and 137 noes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 78, nays 218, answered "present" 4, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 73.]

YEAS—78.

Anderson	Fordney	Knowland, J. R.	Scott
Anthony	French	Langham	Sinnott
Barchfeld	Good	Lenroot	Slomp
Barton	Green, Iowa	Lindquist	Sloan
Bell, Cal.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Butler	Hawley	Mapes	Stafford
Campbell	Hinds	Martin	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Hinebaugh	Mondell	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Howell	Moore	Sutherland
Cramton	Hughes, W. Va.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Norton	Temple
Dillon	Johnson, Utah	Paige, Mass.	Thomson, Ill.
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Towner
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Walters
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Woods
Fairchild	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Young, N. Dak.
Farr	Kindel	Powers	
Fess	Kinkaid	Rogers	



## NAYS—218.

Abercrombie	Deitrick	Hensley	Pou
Adair	Dershem	Hill	Price
Adamson	Dickinson	Holland	Quinn
Aiken	Dies	Houston	Ragsdale
Alexander	Difenderfer	Howard	Rainey
Allen	Dixon	Hughes, Ga.	Raker
Ashbrook	Donohoe	Hull	Rayburn
Aswell	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly, Conn.
Bailey	Doolittle	Igoe	Reilly, Wis.
Baker	Doremus	Jacoway	Rothermel
Baltz	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Rouse
Barkley	Driscoll	Jones	Rubey
Bartlett	Dupré	Keating	Rucker
Bathrick	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Russell
Beakes	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Seldomridge
Blackmon	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Shackelford
Boeber	Ferris	Kitchin	Sherley
Borchers	Fields	Konop	Sherwood
Brockson	Finley	Korbly	Sims
Brodbeck	Fitzgerald	La Follette	Sisson
Brown, N. Y.	FitzHenry	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Brumbaugh	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Small
Bryan	Foster	Leshner	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan, Ill.	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan, Tex.	Francis	Levy	Stanley
Bulkley	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Stedman
Burke, Wis.	Gallivan	Lieb	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Garner	Lindbergh	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tenn.	Linthicum	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tex.	Lloyd	Stevens, N. H.
Callaway	George	Lobeck	Stone
Candler, Miss.	Gilli	Logue	Stout
Cantor	Gillmore	Loneragan	Stringer
Cantrill	Glass	McAndrews	Summers
Caraway	Goeke	MacDonald	Taggart
Carlin	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Talcott, N. Y.
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Tavener
Casey	Gordon	Metz	Taylor, Ark.
Church	Goulden	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Clancy	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Gray	Moon	Tribble
Claypool	Gregg	Morrison	Vaughan
Cline	Griffin	Moss, Ind.	Vinson
Coady	Gudger	Murdock	Yollmer
Collier	Hamlin	Murray	Watkins
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Neeley, Kans.	Watson
Connolly, Iowa	Harris	Neely, W. Va.	Weaver
Conry	Harrison	O'Hair	Webb
Cox	Hay	Oldfield	Williams
Crisp	Hayden	Padgett	Wingo
Crosser	Hellin	Page, N. C.	Witherspoon
Cullop	Helm	Park	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Helvering	Peterson	
Decker	Henry	Phelan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Beall, Tex.	Hulings	Mann	Moss, W. Va.
-------------	---------	------	--------------

## NOT VOTING—123.

Ainey	Frear	Loft	Scully
Austin	Gard	McClellan	Sells
Avis	Gardner	McGillcuddy	Shreve
Barnhart	Gerry	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Md.
Bartholdt	Gillett	McKellar	Smith, Minn.
Borland	Gittins	Maher	Sparkman
Bowdle	Godwin, N. C.	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Britten	Gorman	Miller	Talbott, Md.
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Brown, W. Va.	Griest	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Mott	Taylor, N. Y.
Bruckner	Hamill	Mulkey	Thacher
Burgess	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nelson	Thompson, Okla.
Burke, Pa.	Hart	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson
Calder	Haugen	O'Brien	Treadway
Carew	Hayes	Oglesby	Tuttle
Carr	Helgesen	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cary	Hobson	Palmer	Underwood
Copley	Hoxworth	Parker, N. Y.	Vare
Dale	Johnson, S. C.	Patten, N. Y.	Volstead
Danforth	Kahn	Plumley	Walker
Davis	Keister	Porter	Wallin
Dent	Kent	Post	Walsh
Dooling	Kettner	Prouty	Whaley
Dunn	Kiess, Pa.	Rauch	Whitacre
Edwards	Kreider	Reed	White
Elder	Lafferty	Riordan	Wilson, Fla.
Evans	Langley	Roberts, Mass.	Wilson, N. Y.
Faison	Lazaro	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Falconer	L'Engle	Rupley	Woodruff
Flood, Va.	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

For the session:

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a general pair with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

The name of Mr. MANN was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening, when his name should have been called?

Mr. GILLET. No; I was not. I supposed that this was on a no-quorum vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to proceed.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for 51 per cent Government ownership, with the burden on the Government to establish a profitable business for 49 per cent private proprietorship, while the Government bears the cost of operating until the business pays and then abandons it, as the President recommends in his message to Congress. Either the Government should go into the business or it should stay out of the business. It should do the business for all the people or it should not do it at all.

I would vote for absolute Government ownership of ships. I voted for Government ownership of the Alaskan railways, but would have much preferred to have voted for a bill to provide for Government ownership of the railways in the States, where it would serve the economic interests of the people.

I believe this is a bad time to attempt buying ships. There are none for sale, so far as we have been informed, unless it is the interned ships now lying in our ports, and which under present conditions are tied up and can perform no service until the end of the European war. If the Government is going to own ships, I believe in the Government owning ships absolutely, without a partnership or association with any other than the entire people of the United States. I am unable to find any provision in this bill for which I can vote, and for that reason I shall vote against it. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers quote the Speaker of the House as being against Government ownership, but for this bill. I take the opposite stand—I am for Government ownership of certain utilities, but against this bill unless amended. I am against it because I am for Government ownership of certain steamship lines, and think this bill as it is written jeopardizes that cause. I am against it because it proposes to sell stock to individuals, when the stock can not possibly pay money dividends for many years. I do not think the United States Government should engage in "blue-sky" promotions. The Government should own all the stock.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced three different bills favoring Government-owned and Government-operated steamship lines. The last one was put in a short time ago, and is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21440) providing for the construction of naval auxiliaries and for their operation as merchant vessels in time of peace.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to have built in the Atlantic and Pacific shipyards of the United States naval auxiliaries not exceeding 30 in number, said vessels to be suitable for use as merchant vessels in time of peace.

Sec. 2. That the President is hereby authorized to charter, assign, or transfer any or all of the vessels provided for by this act, and such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, to the Panama Railroad Co. or to any other corporation owned wholly by the United States, and organized for the purpose of acquiring and operating vessels in the intercoastal or foreign trade of the United States, on such terms and conditions as the President of the United States shall prescribe: *Provided*, That vessels so chartered, assigned, or transferred shall be used in intercoastal traffic between the principal Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States and between the ports of the United States and the ports of Mexico, Central America, and South America, and such other foreign ports as the President may designate: *Provided further*, That all vessels so chartered, assigned, or transferred shall be retransferred to the Naval Establishment upon the written order of the President of the United States when in his judgment said vessels are needed for the paramount duties of the Navy.

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of constructing the vessels herein authorized, and for organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on of the traffic provided for in this act, the sum of \$30,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That not more than \$500,000 of the \$30,000,000 herein appropriated shall be used in organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on said traffic.

Sec. 4. That for the purpose of reimbursing the Treasury of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury shall, with the approval of the President, issue and sell or use any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to an amount not exceeding the actual expenditure under this act.

Mr. Speaker, if the bill we are to vote on to-day is passed within the next few weeks, the shipping board will find no vessels it can purchase at anything like a fair price except vessels owned by subjects of nations now at war. All American-built ships and all neutral-built ships are engaged at high rates, and if for sale at all are priced at exorbitant figures. Because England has control of the seas many German vessels are now interned in American harbors, and because of recent war-zone proclamations by Germany many British merchant ships are



being laid up in American ports. The maintenance of these in extended idleness is tremendously expensive, and their owners, because afraid to send them out, are willing to sell at a sacrifice.

These war-owned vessels are the only ones, then, that are at all likely to be purchased, and certain it is that the transfer of each and every one of them carries with it either the probability of being tied up in the admiralty courts of one of the nations at war or else the possibility of war between the United States and some one of the belligerents.

Mr. Speaker, why should we purchase trouble? Why should we put ourselves in position to have our flag on a Government-owned vessel hauled into the courts of a foreign nation? Why should we deliberately send out our Government-owned merchant ships to be shot at? Mr. Speaker, would it not be better for every one of us to wait until the war is over to purchase foreign ships? Would not the American people profit more, and would we not be surer of continued peace in the Nation if we postponed our purchases of vessels owned by belligerent people until after the present war has ceased?

Mr. Speaker, what this Nation should do is to build ships, construct them in American shipyards, for the benefit of American labor, American merchants, and American capital, and when finished place them in the intercoastal carrying trade between the principal ports of the Atlantic, including Gulf coast and the principal ports of the Pacific coast of the United States for the benefit of American shippers and American consumers; also place them in trade between the United States, Central America, and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Government-owned ships for regulatory and pioneer purposes, and I know the Pacific coast would profit greatly by an intercoastal Government-owned, through the canal, traffic line. The Atlantic and Gulf coasts would gain still more, and all would in time be benefited by Government lines to South America.

Mr. Speaker, the Panama Railroad Co. has four merchant ships; the Army and the Navy each have several that can be converted. In all there may be 20 vessels which the Government could put into these two avenues of trade. That number would reasonably supply demands, regulate rates, and pioneer trade for the first year. By that time we can have ready at least half of the vessels proposed in this bill. We can build quickly. Evidence given before the House Naval Committee in August, 1914, includes:

STATEMENT OF MR. FREDERICK W. WOOD, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STEEL CO., SPARROWS POINT, MD.

(See pages 196 and 197 of the House hearings on Senate bill 5259, known as the Weeks bill.)

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Wood, you had a conversation with me a few days ago, in which you suggested what you thought might be a good policy for the Government to pursue in the construction of vessels for use in the trade that we wish to develop. I wish you would give us your views about the matter, with a statement of your standpoint, your knowledge of shipbuilding, construction, cost, etc.

Mr. WOOD. It depends, Mr. Chairman, on what you desire to accomplish.

Mr. TALBOTT. Perhaps I can help you a little on that. Suppose we should want a number of colliers of from 10,000 to 12,000 tons displacement and 14 knots speed—taking that as the basis of displacement, speed, and carriage capacity, and then the fact that they are to be converted into auxiliary vessels for the Navy—

Mr. WOOD. Is your question when could they be constructed?

Mr. TALBOTT. How long would it take to construct them, and what would be the probable cost? Just give us your views about it.

Mr. WOOD. Ships of from 10,000 to 12,000 tons displacement would be of the type of the *Hector*, *Mars*, and *Vulcan*, three colliers now owned by the Government. In the present condition of the coast shipyards, 12 ships of that type, I think, could be constructed in from 9 to 11 months.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would the first delivery be made in nine months?

Mr. WOOD. I think so.

Mr. STEPHENS. And how often would deliveries be made afterwards?

Mr. WOOD. I think that you could get six of them in from 9 to 10 months and the other six from 10 to 11 months. They would be scattered over the different shipyards.

Mr. STEPHENS. If a contract were given you to-day for three such vessels, what would be the earliest moment when you could turn them over complete?

Mr. WOOD. If we pursued the ordinary course of working only dry turns, it would require about 12 months. I should say, for any one of the shipyards to handle three of them. If the price or the amount of money involved would permit working double turns, or the entire 24 hours, the time might be cut down a month and a half, making the first delivery in 7½ months and the last in about 10 months.

Mr. Speaker, we can accomplish great good, and along peaceful lines, if we will. We can keep the money in this country or send it abroad. As for me, I am for American homes, American labor, and American capital. I am for Government ownership in the interest and for the welfare of the American people, and for those reasons only. I am against this bill because I believe it is so worded as to bring trouble, perhaps war, and because it does not authorize or permit intercoastal traffic.

If it could have been amended to avoid foreign courts and foreign complications and permit Government-owned vessels in

traffic between the east and west coasts of the United States, I would vote for it. If it is so amended when it comes back from the Senate, I shall support it with all my might. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I know how humiliating it must be to the many Members on the Democratic side of the House who are voting for this bill contrary to their judgments. If it is not humiliating to you, gentlemen, then I mistake your character for manliness, because if there ever was forced upon a majority action that the majority of the majority believed to be unwise, this is the instance. If it were a mere question of domestic policy, then humiliation would be the only thing that might cause you regret.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNER. I have only 10 minutes; however, I yield for a question.

Mr. GLASS. I want to know who commissioned the gentleman to speak for the majority of the majority and to make a statement that is utterly unwarranted in fact?

Mr. TOWNER. And who commissioned the gentleman to speak for the majority? I have just as much right as he to voice my opinion of existing conditions.

Mr. GLASS. I speak because I am of the majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. I have just as much right to my opinion of the majority as has the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. But the gentleman does not assert an opinion. He asserts an alleged fact, which is not a fact at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I am expressing my opinion regarding the matter. That opinion may be of no value in the estimate of gentlemen, but I will venture to say this, that the vast majority of the people of the United States believe that you are humiliated, and they believe that it is contrary to your judgment and they believe that you are doing it—

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I decline to yield further. They believe that you are doing it, not because you want to, but because it is forced upon you. That is the opinion of the people of the country. I want to say this to you gentlemen—and I have no desire certainly to be unpleasant in my expression regarding it—that if it were a mere question of domestic policy that would be a question that might be left to settle itself, but this is not a mere question of domestic policy. It is a question that is much more serious than that.

The circumstances that surround this case make it almost certain that if you shall succeed in carrying this measure through and putting this plan into operation, that you will carry the Nation into war. The circumstances make it almost certain to lead to that result. This bill is for the purchase of ships. But it means more than that. It means the purchase of certain ships. It means more than that. It means the purchase of German interned ships. You have refused in this House, and it has been refused elsewhere by those high in authority, to limit the purchase of ships to those that are not interned, to take action to preserve this country from the dangers of war, but you refuse to do that. Logically in your view you are compelled to purchase these interned ships if you desire really to increase the shipping facilities. There are no ships available for purchase that will increase the shipping facilities of this country except the German interned ships. You can not build ships to meet this emergency because you have not the time to do so. There is nothing left for you to do except to purchase the German interned ships, and that this administration proposes to do.

The man who will be the governor of this board stated that was the purpose and intention. Time and time again persons who are connected with this movement have refused to say that such was not their purpose and intention. Now, gentlemen, what will that mean? It will not do, as has been said on the floor of this House by gentlemen who are here to-night, to say that it has long been the policy of the United States, that it has long been the policy of Great Britain, to allow the transfer of belligerent vessels to a neutral power after war had commenced. That will not do in this emergency, for the reason that those nations that are at war have declared that for this time and during this period, during this emergency, during this war, they will hold that such transfers can not be made. And so it makes no difference what has been our past policy, it makes no difference what has been the past policy of Great Britain, when Great Britain said, as she did say, shortly after the opening of the war along in last August, that she expected to be governed by the rule of the declaration



of London, except with regard to certain things that are not involved in this controversy, when she affirmatively said that she would adopt a rule that, in effect, says that no belligerent ship can be transferred to a neutral Government after war had been declared for the purpose of escaping the consequence of the war, you are led inevitably into this position—that if you purchase these German interned ships, knowing that the purchase will be held void by those who are now engaged in war, you know that those ships will be taken before their prize courts. You know that their prize courts will hold that the transfer was illegal. You know that the ships, and perhaps their cargoes, will be confiscated. Under these circumstances, what will the United States do? We should remember that in the face of this statement by those countries, knowing what their position would be, knowing what the result of their prize-court finding would be, we have deliberately engaged in this business.

Now, we must either say we insist on our rights to that transfer, and that leads inevitably to war, or else we will submit under circumstances that this Nation can never agree to, if I know anything regarding its spirit. Why should we be forced into such a position as this? Why do you gentlemen force the country into such a condition as this?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly I do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Iowa introduced a bill providing for Government ownership and control of ships. I think it was referred to my committee. Does the gentleman think if that were enacted into law that these same results might follow an indiscreet administration of the law?

Mr. TOWNER. That measure was for the purchase of ships as auxiliaries of the Navy. That certainly would not lead us into war.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And were they not to be used for commercial purposes?

Mr. TOWNER. They were to be used for commercial purposes under certain circumstances; yes—

Mr. ALEXANDER. And that might not lead us into war, according to the gentleman's theory.

Mr. TOWNER. There would be nothing in such a purchase that would in any way embarrass us in our relations with any country now at war. It is perfectly proper for us to increase our Navy in this form and for this purpose, and certainly we can do so without incurring any violation of neutrality. But to do as is now proposed to do, to purchase these interned vessels and send them to belligerent ports, load them with that which will be regarded as contraband of war, and send them into prize courts, where they are almost certain to be subject to confiscation, is to lead us almost inevitably into war. These are the circumstances which surround us now, and I believe that there ought to be enough independence of character, there ought to be enough regard for the rights of our country, there ought to be enough regard for the opinion of this Nation that would keep us from such a dangerous course of procedure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the other side to use some time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that any time be yielded me; but, perhaps, I should express appreciation of the invitation of the gentleman from Missouri to me to indicate to the House my views on the pending question. Mr. Speaker, I experience not one particle of difficulty in giving my support to this measure.

I do not believe it is socialistic; I do not believe it is undemocratic; I do not believe it is un-American, but I believe it is an essential, though latent, function of Government, proper to be exercised whenever the time arrives for its expression. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has been exercised, in greater or less degree, by the municipalities of this and other countries, by the States, and not infrequently by the United States Government. The town in which I live has for 90 years owned its own waterworks and has in recent years expended \$1,000,000 upon the system. A town not far removed from mine, in the district of my colleague, Judge SAUNDERS, has for 10 or 15 years owned its own gas plant. The great city of New York, if I mistake not, has expended recently several hundred millions of dollars to acquire rights and to establish its own waterworks system. The States have exercised this function. My own State of Virginia has built railroads and canals; and the most valuable investment that it has to-day, contributing largely to the educational facilities of the Commonwealth, is its partnership in the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad, operating between Washington and Richmond.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I have but 10 minutes, which seem to have been thrust upon me, and I want to express my attitude in that time without controversy upon this or the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. GLASS. And I think that the exercise now of this function of government to acquire ownership of or partnership in a corporation to operate vessels in the across-seas trade is a perfectly legitimate exercise of a governmental function. Nor am I so anxious to make it temporary as some gentlemen seem disposed to be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not so sure that the emergency is as great as has been described; but, Mr. Speaker, I venture the assertion that the greatest good, if not the only good, that will come to America out of this war is the accentuation at this time of the failure of the Government of the United States to guard the Republic against just such a situation as that which confronts us to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party, having possession of the Government for 40 out of the last 55 years, has neglected to do that, although in its national conventions since 1884 it has solemnly and emphatically declared that an efficient merchant marine is one of the greatest necessities of the country. And while here, to-day, the Democratic Party is charged with neglect and omission, one of the very gentlemen who persist in making this a partisan question stood upon the floor of the House four years ago—I mean the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]—and charged his own party with the responsibility and the "shameful neglect" of failing to provide this country with a merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He was unmistakable in his denunciation of the Republican Party and in his ascription to that party, and that party alone, of responsibility for this failure. He stated in terms that the Republican Party up to the time of his speech, May 20, 1910, had never made an honest effort to provide a merchant marine for this country.

Mr. Speaker, there has been expended here a good deal of nonsense about "instructions from the White House." There have been no instructions from the White House. The spirit of independence on the Democratic side of the House certainly has always equalled, if it has not surpassed, the independence of action that has characterized the conduct of the Republican Party in the House during the 14 years that I have been a Member of this body. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instructions from the White House! Have you gentlemen forgotten the time when your President sent down to this body a railroad bill drafted by his Attorney General, and not one of you would dare to offer to cross a "t" or dot an "i" in it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Socialism! Have you gentlemen forgotten that, within the last 60 days, the greatest Republican President, perhaps, who has sat in the White House since the time of Lincoln, has stated over his own signature that, during the memorable industrial disturbance in the State of Pennsylvania, he was prepared to take over, and was on the eve of seizing, the property of the coal operators and conducting those mines for and in the name of the people of the United States? [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are not proposing that sort of confiscation here. We are not proposing in the emergency of war to seize the vessels owned by the Shipping Trust. But we are proposing to exercise a perfectly well-established governmental function in buying vessels and operating them in order to relieve a situation that is a conceded disgrace to the American Government, and for which the Republican Party is largely responsible by years of legislative impotency and neglect. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is never happier than when he is heaping abuse upon Democratic public officials, and especially upon the President of the United States. He tells us that men on this side are "cursing the President in the cloakroom and praising him upon the floor." Well, Mr. Speaker, at least it must be conceded that Members on this side of the House are exercising better taste than the gentleman from the State of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It could well be wished that the coarse and vituperative abuse which that gentleman, on the floor of the House, has persistently heaped upon the President of the United States, regardless of the dignity of the office and the patriotism of the man who occupies it, might be confined to the cloakroom if the cloakroom would tolerate such intemperate beratings. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Indeed it seems to me that the sort of vituperation and disparagement of which the gentleman from Washington is constantly guilty is better suited to the stable than to the cloakroom. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I am sure there is no Member of the House on this side who would challenge the gentleman's preeminence in that species of detraction. I even venture to believe that



there is not a Member of the House on that side who would care to emulate his example or seek to appropriate his laurels. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have observed the course of this debate, and I find two objections urged against this proposition. It is first contended that this bill, if enacted into law, will interfere with private enterprise and, secondly, that it will endanger the peace of the country. No other argument has been advanced why this bill should not be enacted into law. These two objections I will in the course of my remarks answer, if not to the satisfaction of those who oppose this bill, at least to the satisfaction of myself and those who favor the bill.

Serious complaint is indulged by gentlemen that the "gag rule" has been applied; that we intend to jam this bill through without sufficient consideration. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] said that there were no hearings and that this bill was drafted without deliberation and without the information upon which to intelligently act. In this he is very much mistaken. I am not a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine, and do not know what investigation was made by that committee, nor how fully informed the members were when the Alexander bill was reported to this House during the last session. The Weeks bill, which constitutes the first four sections of the present bill, is the product of years of careful study of this subject by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and unanimously, I am informed, passed the Senate upon full consideration early in the month of last August. That bill was sent to this House and was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and by that committee referred to a subcommittee, of which I had the honor to be a member. That subcommittee gave much time and thought to the Weeks bill, and had hearings covering a period of 10 days, with many material witnesses who gave valuable information to the committee.

The committee being advised, cooperated in drafting the Alexander bill, and particularly secured in the Alexander bill the incorporation of that provision authorizing that all ships purchased should be of a type, so far as practicable, suitable for auxiliary use in the Navy, and be transferred to the use of the Navy when no longer used for the purposes of commerce or when required for the paramount needs of the Navy, upon the order and direction of the President. The Alexander bill formed the basis of the Gore bill, which constitutes a part of the pending bill. So I say that it is not true and the gentlemen misstate the fact when they inform this House and the country that there has been no consideration of the present bill. The Gore bill is but an amendment of the Alexander bill, so that the bill now pending in this House is the Weeks bill and the Alexander bill as amended by the Gore bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If the Weeks bill was considered to be of such great value, why is it that in its present form it is not expected to go into effect until two years after its passage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not said that the Weeks bill standing alone is of such great importance. I do see much merit in the Weeks bill. What I was speaking of was the consideration that has been given to these bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to be informed. I find that in the print put out early this morning of House resolution 722, on page 9, section 9, no mention is made of Alaska, but in a later print of the same resolution, on line 10 of page 9, section 9, it says, "Vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and owned by such corporation," and so forth, "shall engage in trade with foreign countries or Alaska, the Philippines," and so forth. Now, what I want to know is, Will it be possible for one of these Government ships to load with an out cargo and then load abroad a foreign cargo, bring it through the Panama Canal and around to Alaska as against the coastwise trade of Alaska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand this bill, the amendment which the gentleman indicates precludes these vessels from engaging in the coastwise trade and limits their operation to trade with foreign countries, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and

Alaska, the amendment including Alaska being added by the authority of the caucus last evening—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Without debate on the part of anyone who knew anything about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS (continuing). After full discussion, and for the purpose of enabling these vessels to reach the coal fields of Alaska and to deliver that coal wherever it may be needed for purposes of commerce and trade.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. This bill allows ships owned by this company to engage in the coastwise shipping trade, just as ships owned by private companies are allowed to engage in the coastwise shipping trade if they are American-built ships. If they are not American-built ships they can not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not Alaska by this bill included in the foreign shipping trade?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but I understand by the terms of this bill ships built in the United States may engage in the coastwise trade.

Much has been said in this argument about who is to blame for the fact that we have no merchant marine. I do not propose to go into that question here to-night. It is sufficient to say that the Democratic Party is not responsible for the disappearance of our merchant marine from the high seas. That has occurred within the 50 years since the Republican Party has been dominant in this country. But I do want to invite attention briefly to the conditions that surround us to-day. These conditions consist of absolute extortion in the way of freight rates for the transportation of American products which are needed in the foreign markets, and to meet this condition we propose to do what private capital has refused to do.

I want to communicate a fact to this House which has not been mentioned thus far in this debate. I can give you, gentlemen, some reason why the President is very much concerned about this proposition. Following the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, when our shipping was disturbed, when German ships were interned in our ports, the President of the United States sent for and held conferences with men engaged in trans-Atlantic transportation. He pointed out to them the conditions which prevailed; he pointed out to them the fact that these interned ships, idle in our harbors, could be purchased in good faith and put into commerce at a very reasonable price; in fact, that they were upon the bargain counter; and he asked these men as patriotic American citizens to invest their capital in these ships and give outlet to the products of the American farm and factory.

What answer do you suppose these patriotic gentlemen, the Shipping Trust, which has been defended for hours upon that side of the House, gave to the President in response to his plea that they invest their money in these enterprises? Their conditions, stated briefly, were these: "We will put our money in this project if you, the Government of the United States, will insure our ships and our cargoes free and guarantee us 4 per cent net upon our investment."

Before proceeding to reply to the contentions of gentlemen that this bill, if enacted into law, will interfere with private business and endanger the peace of America, I wish to invite the attention of the House to the conditions which confront the country now and which appear to render this bill necessary. One thing is true, and all men admit it: That we have no merchant marine; that more than 90 per cent of our foreign trade, both exports and imports, is carried in foreign bottoms at foreign rates fixed by shipping companies which have no interest in America or in American trade other than to profit by the extortionate charges imposed upon us. There has never been but one remedy proposed for this condition of things by the Republican Party, and that in keeping with their usual habit of diverting the American Treasury to the use and benefit of special interests—the proposed ship subsidy—by means of which it has been proposed by the Republican Party, sustained by declarations in their party platforms, to vote money out of the Treasury as a direct subsidy to the shipping interests in order to foster and encourage that industry. The solicitude of our Republican friends for the shipping interests, one of the greatest monopolies on earth, is clearly manifested not only by their former attempts to vote a direct ship subsidy, but by their anxiety here lest we, by creating competition and a means of conveying American products to foreign markets, may interfere with and reduce the profits of this great trust. Some one said this afternoon that the Republican Party can always be depended upon to come to the defense whenever a blow is struck at special interests, and that the Democratic Party can always be relied upon to defend the cause of our country against the en-



croachments of organized greed. Such has been the course of events during the present Congress, and this spirit has been manifested not only in the opposition to the tariff bill and the enactment of the Federal reserve act, but in the opposition which was urged so strenuously against the repeal of the Panama tolls act and the enactment of the amendments to the antitrust law.

What are the conditions which justify—or, if you please, render necessary—the enactment of this bill? I have already mentioned the fact that we have no merchant marine and that we are at the mercy of the foreign shipping industry, which has at all times practiced extortion upon us. But what of the present conditions? The fact must not be overlooked that the ships engaged in the carrying trade of one of the great commercial nations of the world are completely out of the business. German ships that have not been destroyed on the high seas have taken refuge in neutral ports, and are idle. This affects the shipping business generally and removes the principal competition in the world's commerce, which tended not only to maintain reasonable shipping facilities but to secure reasonable freight rates. In addition to this many of the English ships which formerly were engaged in the ocean carrying trade have been withdrawn and are used in connection with the army and navy, and that again has materially reduced the number of ships engaged in trans-Atlantic trade. So that by these means the number of ships engaged in transporting American products to the marts of the world have been materially reduced, and as a consequence the most extortionate rates exacted ever known in the commercial history of the world. A reference to the tables, which show the tremendous increase in freight rates of 100 to 300 per cent in the brief time since the European war opened, startles the imagination and arouses a sense of indignation that the necessities of man should be taken advantage of by the cupidity of the shipping interests to such an extent as to deprive the people of the world of those commodities which are necessary for the sustenance of life and the maintenance of national existence. These tables, furnished by the Department of Commerce, demonstrate to an absolute certainty that extortion, unjustified and unprecedented, is being practiced upon Americans, and that the profits that we would otherwise derive from the present high prices for food products and the output of our factories are being consumed by a merciless shipping trust, which our Republican friends fear will be interfered with by competition created by this proposed legislation.

When gentlemen assert that we will destroy or seriously impair private industry by Government ownership and regulation of ocean commerce, they mean that we will interfere with the profits that the Shipping Trusts are receiving as a result of extortionate freight charges practiced upon our people. This is the reason for the great concern manifested here and the solicitude expressed by gentlemen on that side of the House who oppose this bill.

The next proposition advanced is that this project will endanger the peace of America. It will be difficult to convince the American public that this administration, which has so nobly maintained the peace of the United States in Mexico and abroad when three-fourths of the civilized world is locked in a death struggle, will do an act or take a step which will endanger the peace of our country. The American people have absolute confidence and implicit faith in the judgment, the wisdom, and the patriotism of Woodrow Wilson, and can not be persuaded by partisan attacks and bitter denunciation that he will, by his recommendation and his solicitude for the welfare of his country and his splendid efforts to secure a market for American products, endanger the peace of our country and involve us in war. The arguments advanced why this bill may endanger our peace are that we have not the legal right under international law to acquire interned vessels, and that if the Government is engaged in the transportation of contraband goods it will become directly involved with nations now engaged in war. The hearings before the committee include the statements of Mr. Lansing, Counselor of the Department of State, who appeared before the committee and gave his views on this important question, and expressed his belief that the use by a private corporation of ships transferred to it by the United States would not involve the United States in serious foreign complications any more than ships otherwise owned and operated by a private corporation.

What does this bill propose? That the United States may become a stockholder in a corporation the object and purposes of which are to aid the commerce of the United States; that the Government shall finance the concern by purchasing and acquiring ships and transfer them to the corporation, in consideration of the bonds of the corporation secured by a lien

upon all of its assets; that the United States shall own a controlling interest in the stock of the concern, and reserve the right to withdraw these vessels and use them as auxiliaries in the Navy in case they should be required for that purpose. Now, it is argued from the mere fact that the Government would own stock in a corporation engaged in transportation that the Government itself would be engaged in the business, and that a seizure or search of a vessel owned and operated by the corporation would directly involve the United States. I fail to see the force and logic of this contention. Certainly the corporation itself could not become involved in the use of ships acquired in good faith and for actual consideration in the transportation of food products and other commodities not contraband of war, and I think it may be safely said here that the Government of the United States, owning and controlling a majority of the stock in the concern, will not permit contraband goods to be transported in ships thus acquired and in which the Government has a reversionary interest. It is not the purpose of this bill to convey arms and ammunition and munitions of war to belligerents, but to convey products of the American farm and factory—food and provisions—to stricken people across the Atlantic, who need the necessities of life which we possess in such great abundance. Shall the American Government, for fear that it may interfere with private enterprise and depreciate the excessive profits of the Shipping Trust, refuse the demand for transportation facilities and an outlet to American products?

Let me ask you, gentlemen, if you honestly and in good faith believe that the President of the United States, who has so nobly maintained the peace of our country in Mexico and abroad during these troublous times, proposes to do one thing that will endanger the peace of our country or bring our honor or our integrity into dispute?

Shall the Government of the United States be so unmindful of the interests of its own people as to deny their just demands because somebody says, for political reasons, that we may endanger the peace of the country? Now is the opportune time. I do not advocate the high-handed tactics of some nations who would take advantage of world-wide conditions for territorial aggrandizement and the exaction of treaties and terms and conditions, long coveted, which can not be had in ordinary times or under ordinary conditions, but I do take the position that it is the duty of the Government of the United States to take advantage of conditions as they are and enforce its just demands against the world. I believe it the duty of the Government of the United States to hoist the American flag on every vessel sailing the seas which may become entitled to American registry, load these ships with the surplus products which we have in such great abundance, and say to the world, "There flies the American flag. This cargo bears the seal of the Government of the United States. Hands off!"

What nation now engaged in war would have either the means or the disposition to interfere? England and Germany and France and Russia and Austria have their hands full, each a check on the other, and dare not turn upon the United States and assail the integrity of the American flag on the high seas. As an American, I would give them to understand and proclaim to the world that the bounty of Providence, so liberally bestowed as a reward for American enterprise and American industry, shall be conveyed on the high seas under the American flag to God's creatures everywhere.

It has been said that the people of this country are not in sympathy with this proceeding. Let me say to you that I can speak for one section of this country. I believe I can speak with entire confidence as to the sentiment in the State of Illinois. I say to you that the people of that State, not only Democrats, but Republicans and Progressives as well, are with the President in his effort here to secure fair transportation rates, and they will uphold his hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have been delightfully entertained here to-day, but I have not heard a man yet tell you that the trust that is behind this proposition is the real cause of this filibuster that you have had here all day long. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are confronted with a very serious proposition. We have the greatest trust, a thieving, piratical trust that is oppressing the poor people, the producers of wealth, the farmers, and all other people of this Republic who actually make it a Nation worth living in. Who is it that says the Republican side knows nothing of a Shipping Trust? The distinguished Republican gentleman from Pennsyl-



vania [Mr. MOORE] volunteered that remarkable information to this great body about two hours ago. I would like to know if you could take a white-oak maul and a hickory glut and knock Republican eyes open wide enough to see as big a giant as the shipping monopoly is? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Is it possible that these gentlemen are unaware of the existence of a trust that has been capable of raising the price of freights across the ocean \$18,018,700 in the one month of December? These figures are authentic from the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. And if you put this off 12 months, according to that rate, on your export freight alone you will have a total of \$216,000,000 in one year increase over the amount charged for hauling the same freight before the ships of some of the nations engaged in war were forced off of the high seas. Then put on to that your import trade, and you have an increase of \$312,000,000 in one year for the same quantity of freight carried between the United States and European countries over the normal freight rates. That is eight times this \$40,000,000 that this Government proposes to put into the business now. Who has the "gall" to vote against this ship-purchase bill when he knows it will save the American people nearly one-half of a billion dollars in one year on freight that crosses the Atlantic Ocean? Do you tell me there is not a shipping trust? [Applause on the Democratic side.] After the war broke out in Europe this Congress passed a bill authorizing the United States Government to insure the cargoes going to Europe. The insurance rate is one-eighth of 1 per cent, so you see it is plain with such a low rate of insurance that the Shipping Trust is robbing our people, when it has raised the freight on cotton from \$1.25 a bale to \$18 a bale. This Government can not regulate the rate on the seas. Shall we let the shipping combine rob our people, or shall we lower the freight rate on the seas by putting ships in commission to compete with this blood-sucking vampire. I tell you that the Republicans on this floor are marching under the banner of the Ship Trust that is oppressing the poor people of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party is aiding the greatest trust that ever oppressed the human race. The Republican Party, claiming not to know that there is such a trust, has filibustered in the other end of this Capitol for three long weeks to keep this law from being enacted.

The Republican Party is causing the fame of the United States Senate to be brought into disrepute, and not satisfied with that, the Republicans in this end of the Capitol have proceeded to filibuster here for the same purpose. I want to tell you, my friends, that the American people have not been asleep. They know that this bill will save the situation. They know that none of you are afraid of Government ownership. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They know that the people of this Republic will stand for this bill. They know it is going to build up the merchant marine and break up the Ship Trust, this band of commercial pirates that now has the wealth producers and business men of this country by the throat, and is daily reaching the filthy hands of greed into the pockets of our people. And for one I am not afraid of the Government staying in this business permanently, either. I am for it not only as a temporary measure but I am for it to continue to carry the products of this country to the markets of the world and bring back whatever goods our people need to keep from being plundered by manufacturing trusts in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No farmer can depend on borrowing a wagon to haul his produce to town. We ought to have our own ships to carry our produce across the high seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And there can never be a better time than right now, when the patriotic President of this country, backed up by Mr. Bryan and that grand old commoner, the Democratic Speaker, together with the Democratic majority in the Senate and in this House, with all of the Democratic hosts of this land, is asking this Congress to pass this measure in the interest of fairness to the people of this great Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This is a struggle between the people and special privilege. Shall the Ship Trust be permitted to hold up the people and rob them of the fruits of their toil?

You Republicans as a party have always stood for privilege and all of its freebooting activities in exploiting the people. In opposing this bill you mean to allow the Ship Trust a free hand in continuing to rob the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY], who always speaks words of truth, and who will diversify these proceedings a little. [Applause.]

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut—

CAPT. WILSON ON THE BRIDGE.

There are ships that pass in the night,  
And others that pass in the day;  
There are some that don't pass at all—  
They depend on the syndicate's say.

The Democrats want Uncle Sam  
To now build ships that will sail  
With cargoes of Yankee-made goods  
And land them abroad without fail.

Republicans stand up and howl,  
They bellow and threaten and prate;  
They fear lest the profits will shrink—  
They're friends of the ship syndicate.

They throw out their chests and look wise;  
They accuse Democrats of intent  
To ruin the trade of the seas;  
They claim that we are hell bent.

They say that the syndicate ships,  
Now building and those now afloat,  
Can get all the business there is,  
When they only get Uncle Sam's goat.

The syndicate's real busy now  
Making bluffs about building ships,  
But it's only because it now sees  
The boats in the Government slips.

On the bridge of the great ship of state  
Stands Wilson, our captain is he;  
It's a pleasure to serve him on land,  
It's high honor to sail o'er the sea.

With him in the ships that we own,  
The craft that will set shippers free  
From the grasp of the ravenous crew  
To which we have long bent the knee.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

In his care the people feel safe,  
They know that he knows their will,  
And that's why we rally to-night  
To put through the Wilson ship bill.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Seven minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I yield that time back to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will ask gentlemen on the other side to use some of their time, as there will be only one other speech on this side. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] four minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of the principle of Government ownership involved in this bill, and I am heartily in favor of an American merchant marine; but I do not want this great country, with its high ideals, to establish this principle in the blood, suffering, and sorrow of the great tragedy across the ocean. I am opposed to it because it will involve us in war. [Manifestations of derision on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind gentlemen that the more noise they make and the greater racket they keep up, the later they will get to bed. [Laughter.]

Mr. FARR. It may involve us in war, and not with Great Britain, either, because this, in effect, is a pro-British measure. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must remember that this is not a beer garden or a vaudeville show.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, England never has been opposed to this bill. It wants us to buy the German interned ships. Every advantage from more ships will accrue to the allies and be to the disadvantage of the Germans. Is there any opportunity for us to send one of our ships to a German port? The allies need our munitions of war and foodstuffs. We have ample bottoms to convey to them their legitimate needs.

The additional ships that we put upon the ocean will be sending powder and other munitions of war and foodstuffs to continue that awful war. I have heard men on the floor of this House say that if the Vollmer resolution, to prevent the exportation of munitions of war, came out of the committee, they would support it, and yet they are going to vote for this bill, which means thousands and thousands of tons of powder and



thousands and thousands of tons of other munitions of war to go there to help continue that dreadful warfare.

Let me read from an afternoon newspaper to show you just how thin ice we are skating on:

Germans resent attitude of the United States. Hostile feeling may cause crisis. Americans feeling Berlin, following criticism in press. German papers stir people with charge that United States is siding with the allies.

We are about to enact into legislation a measure that means advantages to the allies and a danger and an affront to Germany. I want to repeat that in effect this is a pro-British measure and that by making it a law we risk war with Germany; and if we escape war with that great nation we invite its bitter attitude toward us for years and will disturb the good feeling of the German citizens of this country.

Let us preserve our neutrality and avoid war.

My first consideration shall be for peace and the prevention of bloodshed.

By my vote you shall not increase the number of widows, orphans, broken hearts, and wrecked homes in Europe for the advantage of the manufacturers of weapons of war.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I was laboring under a misapprehension when I said that there would be only one speech on this side.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, no time is more inopportune to launch into Government ownership of shipping than the present. As I view the pending bill, it means that we are to purchase the only available ships, and those are the interned German ships. As I pointed out on a prior occasion, the purchase by a citizen of a neutral government of ships registered under a belligerent flag after the outbreak of hostilities does not relieve it of seizure by any belligerent power, and this confiscable character does not change when a government is the purchaser; but such a purchase would be more questionable as to the good faith of the transaction to avoid confiscation, in that it is no part of a government's business to engage in the purchase of merchant ships. Article 56 of the declaration of London expresses the principle of international law in forbidding any such transfer after hostilities have arisen.

Everyone who has been following the diplomatic discussion over the *Dacia* realizes that our Government would be buying a lawsuit to purchase these interned ships, which do not dare to be operated for fear of confiscation. But I bottom my main objection on the fact that under existing conditions, with England in control of the seas, they will not be used in an impartial, neutral way so that we can supply our wares and our goods to all the belligerent countries alike, but they will be used for the shipment of our merchandise to the powers that have control of the sea.

Nothing is more certain from statistics cited here than that the increase of foreign commerce resulting since the outbreak of the war has been largely of those articles in which the foreign governments now engaged in war are directly using to carry on the war, such as guns, ammunition, automobiles, wearing apparel, leather, foodstuffs, rubber, and everything that enables the warring powers to maintain the dreadful struggle that is going on to-day. If you think that the purchase of these ships will relieve us of embarrassment, I fear you are too sanguine as to the result. As I view it, they will only accentuate the difficulty that now confronts the administration.

Mr. METZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I can not yield. I know what the gentleman's position is; he is a shipper. Nothing is more certain than that at the present time the American shipper is not paying the freight. The foreign Governments who are taking our foodstuffs, who are demanding our munitions of war, demanding our automobiles, are paying the price asked by the American manufacturers and the American producer, and the European consumer is paying the freight, whether it be a Government or a private establishment. They need our wares and they are paying our price. This bill in its large sense, when you come to analyze its effect, is for the especial benefit, whether so intended I will not say, of those belligerent powers which now have the advantage of getting our supplies—our foodstuffs and munitions of war—and it is certain that Germany and Austria are not in that favored position. It is stated that we are going to use some of these vessels in the South American trade. Why, if the gentleman is sincere in that position, why do you not put the Weeks bill into immediate operation instead of postponing its operation for two years. Everybody who stops to reflect a moment knows that

the direct effect of this bill will be to supply the allies with our products, as we have little or no communication to speak of with Germany or Austria. Certainly this is so as far as munitions of war are concerned.

Great Britain since the outbreak of the war has changed its contraband list two or three times by adding articles that have been generally regarded as conditional contraband. Under the declaration of London foodstuffs are conditional contraband and could be shipped in neutral ships without seizure to neutral countries, and even to belligerent countries when not consigned for the benefit of the Government itself. And yet Great Britain in her imperious way has made foodstuffs contraband. These vessels, under section 5 of the bill, are not to be controlled by the shipping board. If you will examine the provisions of section 5, you will see that the shipping board has control of the rates, but that it has no control of the traffic, neither the course nor the character of the cargo, no control of the routes, and only control over the rates for a period not longer than 12 months.

Take the case of a person who desires to ship foodstuffs abroad—not a highly imaginary case by any means when we find the *Wilhelmina*, a neutral vessel, with a cargo of foodstuffs destined for Germany, being held up by Great Britain and its cargo threatened as a prize if its captain persists on continuing his journey. To what court is that taken? Not to the United States court, as this bill provides. No; it is taken to the prize court of Great Britain to have the question of contraband determined by its Admiralty decrees. Are we keeping aloof from this entanglement by entering upon a venture that may lead to such embarrassment?

A large part of the American people, this great body of German-Americans in this country, believe that we are not acting impartially to-day in allowing munitions of war to be sent to the allies alone, with the allies in control of the sea. Do you mean to say that when they see foodstuffs on American vessels destined for Germany, which we regard as conditional contraband and not liable to seizure, captured by Great Britain, that these 5,000,000 of loyal Americans, true to the flag, will permit that insult without a vigorous protest? Oh, my fellow Representatives, these are acute times that confront the American people. We will be on the verge of embarrassing situations if we pass this measure. My only purpose is to have this Government remain absolutely neutral, but you can not operate this shipping bill unless it is going to involve us in difficulties.

There is no question but that the Weeks bill is only a ruse in order to hang this administration shipping bill on, which, as I view it, only accentuates the difficulties that may confront our Government. The mere fact that freight rates are increasing is no justification for our launching into this Government-ownership proposition. Every speech, save one, of the advocates of this proposition has been bottomed on the argument in favor of Government ownership. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] justified his position because municipalities and States had indulged in Government ownership of natural monopolies. But I say to him and I say to you, that where the seas are open to everyone who can build a ship, shipping can not be considered a natural monopoly. It is free, and to-day when American capital is seeking to invest its surplus capital that is lying idle in the financial centers, you are driving that capital away from investment, because American capital will never seek investment in competition with the Government. It can not compete, because in every line of activity where the Government has undertaken to invade private employment the rates charged for that service have not been based upon the actual cost of service, but have been rates where fixed charges, allowances for depreciation, and other elements of cost have been ignored completely. Just when the time is auspicious for American capital to invest in ships the Government plans to check this movement by this fatuous policy.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. METZ. Does the gentleman suppose for one moment that if Germany and the Germans felt as the gentleman says he does, we could buy these German ships that are interned here?

Mr. STAFFORD. The German Government has no control over those ships.

Mr. METZ. It has, absolutely.

Mr. STAFFORD. The persons in the companies who own these ships are controlled by the same selfish instincts that the gentleman and I would be in a business matter.

Mr. METZ. Do you—

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield until I can answer the other question, and then I will yield. Those German ships are controlled by private corporations which desire, unquestionably, the release of their capital for investment in lines of profitable employment.



The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on the other side have not taken advantage of the time allotted to them to discuss this bill. They have been indulging in the same tactics here that the Republican Party has indulged in and is indulging in in the Senate, and while the Democratic Party is trying to bring relief to American shippers they are doing the bidding of the Shipping Trust. [Applause.] We can regulate interstate and intrastate freight rates. We can regulate the shipping rates in our country, but we can not regulate them on the high seas, and gentlemen here know that.

The only way at this time to break the hold that this foreign ship trust has upon the throat of the American people is to operate American ships as is here provided, and carry our produce to the markets of the world. This heartless and cruel monopoly has taken advantage of conditions created by war; and in defiance of every principle of justice and fairness, it is robbing the American people of millions of dollars by its outrageous and oppressive ocean freight rates.

From the time the war in Europe commenced in July to December, 1914, the ocean freight cost increased 141 per cent; and by the increased rate now charged on the shipments of American produce the ship trust collects in two months more money than it will cost our Government to buy and operate these ships. Think of that. The increase in ocean freight rates above that being charged in July, 1914, collected now in two months from American shippers is more than the amount necessary to buy ships to carry the produce of our farms and factories to the markets of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this merciless monopoly has increased the shipping rate on cotton from \$1.25 per bale to \$18 and \$20 per bale. It has increased the rate on grain 900 per cent; and it has increased in like fashion the rate on coal and lumber and everything that is produced upon the American farm. And yet the Republican Party in both branches of Congress is doing everything in its power to defeat this bill, which proposes to cut down this tremendous ocean freight rate and stop this holdup and robbery of the American people.

The markets of Europe are calling for the products of our farms and factories and our people are suffering because their produce is outlawed by the high shipping rate, and the produce itself is rotting at the docks. Millions of dollars worth of agricultural products are now waiting for ships to take them to the European markets; but you gentlemen will not vote to bring relief to our own people, but you are voting just as the Ship Trust now robbing our people want you to vote.

Mr. Speaker, these same Republicans who tried to drive the President into war with Mexico in order to protect in Mexico the property of certain interests in this country, and when they failed denounced him as a man who stood for peace at any price, are now expressing fear that he will involve us in war. Their disgusting, quick, and sudden change of front reminds me of the old fellow who went to Texas. He wrote back to his brother, and said: "Dear Bill, if you haven't started to Texas, don't, for this is the most hellacious climate in the world. [Laughter.] Yesterday, while driving a yoke of steers across the prairie, one of them had a sunstroke, and while I was a skinnin' him the other one froze to death." [Laughter and applause.]

Let me say to you, gentlemen, that we will meet you on this issue before the American people, and then you will have an opportunity to explain why you opposed a measure—an emergency measure—to grant them relief from the organized pirates of the sea. [Applause.]

We will call upon you to explain why you opposed a shipping bill that would greatly reduce the shipping rate on American produce and to tell the people why you were willing for a foreign shipping trust to rob our own people, already distressed on account of the war.

Mr. Speaker, here is an opportunity to build up our foreign trade, to get trade that we have never had, but the Republicans are not willing to lose an opportunity to fight a Democratic administration in its efforts to benefit the American people and serve the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have here a telegram from an American consul in Italy, which says:

Italy needs 1,000,000 tons American coal, 300,000 tons steel, hundreds of thousands tons American goods. Beg Government furnish ships. America can get entire trade permanently.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

This message comes to us from the people across the seas, and yet gentlemen stand here and oppose our great President in

his efforts to provide speedy means for carrying American produce to the markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say to gentlemen on that side that the idea in the Weeks bill is not of Republican origin. It is of Democratic origin. Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas more than a year before Mr. WEEKS introduced his bill embodied this idea in a bill that he introduced in this House and it is of Democratic origin. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You Republicans do not want American produce to leave the docks and reach the markets. You do not want business to improve and prosperity to return. You know that this measure will improve business and restore prosperity in a large degree, and you do not want prosperity before the next election.

You had rather be returned to power than to see labor employed, business good, and the country blossom as the rose. [Applause.] But, gentlemen, we are going to provide for sending the products of our farms and factories to Europe. We will see to it that our produce goes abroad. More men here will be employed, money will come into our country, prosperity will come, and you will go. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Weeks bill as it is before this House now. The Democratic Party have permitted it to lie in committee for months, yet now give swift notice that they are in favor of that bill, but strangely enough they would enact only to postpone its action for two years. If it is a good thing, why not put it in operation? I have tried with all my heart to understand the arguments on both sides in this discussion, and when I listened to the admirable speech of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] I was charmed and delighted, and I said to myself if what he says is true this bill ought to go through, but when I listened to the other side and found gentlemen whom I believe quite as honest and I believe somewhat more intelligent upon the subject [laughter], that threw me into doubt again.

If the Democrats of this House, Mr. Speaker, would only do as the great Progressive Party, as represented on this floor, has done [laughter], they would depend upon their own judgment. Men who weigh and consider, as the Progressives do, are divided upon this important proposition. [Laughter.] But we find the Democrats all of one mind. I have heard reasons given for this unanimity that are not complimentary to their personal independence, but let us not go into that. I am in favor of Government ownership [applause] for the purpose of maintaining regulatory rates on the high seas. I do not fear the socialistic idea. Any person who has studied our public-road system, our public-school system, our Postal System, and municipal ownership are no longer scared at this bugaboo of socialism. I believe that certain conditions may arise, such as have been referred to at length on the floor, when it becomes the duty of the organized powers of society to take hold and regulate such conditions in the interest of the public welfare, when private initiative is unequal to the task; and I would be in favor of this bill if it were Government ownership and a fair experiment of governmental operation and control; but this bill, as I study it, as I see it, means nothing of the sort. It is not proposed here seriously that the Government shall operate these lines. It is carefully arranged that these lines of ships may be leased. Who is going to lease and operate these ships? Is it not most likely it will be by men who are already in the shipping business? Will not the great Shipping Trust, if it exists, as I believe it does—will not they see to it that their agents get those leases, and will not they operate them in such a way, notwithstanding the power of the Government to fix regulatory rates, but still operate them in such a way as that it will not interfere much with their monopoly, by delays and lack of facilities driving the shippers away from patronizing the Government-owned ships? Of course this would cost the trust some money, but would not much disturb its control of rates. I do not fear, Mr. Speaker, this idea of war very much. I think the danger of foreign entanglements is overdrawn. I have got the notion that it would serve American interests better if we took a bolder stand upon American rights than we have been taking, for my idea is that Germany, Austria, France, and England have all the war they want and will not have appetite for any more of it in the near future. So, while I do not regard the Government ownership of merchant ships of great hazard, my opposition to this bill is because it will not give the Government control of rates nor the public relief from the extortions of the Shipping Trust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].



Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, these are degenerate and evil days we are drifting into in one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world. It is humiliating to acknowledge it. Within four days after we have dedicated a monument to the memory of the greatest American commoner, Abraham Lincoln, we have to confess that this Government has become for the time being a Government of the White House, by the White House, and for the White House.

Let us see ourselves as others see us and see if the photograph will not be recognized. Take the headlines in the daily press as to what is happening in this body and what, let us ask, has become of the legislative prerogatives of the great representative department in the legislation of the Government? The headlines in the Star of last Friday afternoon are these:

Wilson rejects Gore ship bill—Refuses to agree to amendment limiting activities of United States in shipping business.

The headlines in the Washington Post of the next—Saturday—morning:

Ship fight in House—Administration hopes to force passage by gag rule.

Read the headlines in the Times of last evening:

Crack party whip to jam ship bill through the House.

These are not the heated arguments of partisans in debate. They are the ordinary news indications of what is happening in the House of Representatives, and honest news gatherers could not describe the degeneracy into which this legislative body has descended with accuracy without using phraseology something like this.

By the same token, under orders from the Legislative Mansion—with proper acknowledgments to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—you gentlemen could put through the House with the same vote you had in the caucus last night, which is supposed to be 154, and probably would proceed to do so as heartily, a repeal of the Ten Commandments, of the Apostles' Creed, or the Sermon on the Mount. And you could do it by the caucus methods you have adopted for Democratic legislation.

This is one of the biggest pieces of political junk and undigested, un-American socialism that was ever skidded through the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is not 10 per cent of the membership of this body that believes in the principles of this bill or the provisions that you are supposed to enact into this legislation.

We have heard you talk in the lobbies of the hotels, about the tables in the dining rooms, and on the streets, as we have conversed together, and it is not betraying any friendly secrets to make the estimate that probably there is not 20 per cent of the membership on either side of this Chamber that believes heartily in this measure. And if any of you Democrats who are instructed to pass it should find this bill rising up and embarrassing you in the next campaign I am one of the friends you can call upon to prove an alibi. Your heart is not in this legislation. It is not your bill. As the Speaker is reported to have said to you in the secret caucus last night, the President wants it. If you do not pass it you will have an extra session, and he has prophesied what disaster that would mean to the Democratic Party. The schoolmaster has announced that you Democratic schoolboys will have no recess and will be kept in after school if you do not perform the stunt that is laid out for you, and you are performing under the smart of the ruler of the master and under the threat of the hickory switch. The whole nomenclature of legislation in the Congress of the United States has had to undergo a change in order to adapt itself to present methods of legislation. It is a minority government that we are living under, from the White House, through the House of Representatives, and on through the Senate. If correctly reported, last night 154 Members of this body decided what shall be the destiny of this legislation in the House of 435 Members.

After the last census was taken, believing in a representative Government and in order to have a better representation of the real sentiment of all parts of this Republic, now numbering about 100,000,000 in population, we enlarged the representation of this body up to 435 Members. And yet if you are to legislate by instructions from the White House and then tie up and gag your own membership by a bare majority in a secret caucus, I suggest, in the interest of economy in this administration, which is confessedly confronted with an enormous financial deficit, there is no just reason why Congress should not take a vacation without pay, at least until the termination of the present administration. One good office boy with a couple of rubber stamps could perform the perfunctory duties that are expected to be discharged in these two Houses of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.] It would be an enormous saving to the country.

We do not perform legislative functions upon administrative measures in this body any longer by a combat of intellectual powers and in honest debate. If the cloture rule can be established in the other end of the Capitol, which the evening papers announce the President in his confidential interviews with the members of the press this morning announced he was in favor of, there is no reason why, so far as administrative measures are concerned, you can not hereafter adopt them while you wait. Football legislation, legislation by main strength, legislation by the use of the hollow square, the flying "V," and the athletic wedge, and team work. You have a captain of the team. What will become of you if you still have some vestige of your own independence left and decline to play the game you will find set forth in the Indianapolis speech, which has become the new handbook of a declining Democracy. Here it is:

If any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic team for any purpose or from any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them.

Whether you are to be actually beheaded or are only to suffer political execution does not clearly appear. You have a captain who expects to hold you to account.

We hear a good deal about pernicious lobbying. The most pernicious lobby is the official lobby. Cabinet officers cease to be active heads of great executive departments and become lecturers before commercial clubs and social teas—lobbying for administration measures.

Autocracy is not Democracy; it is government by dictation, instead of government by representatives of the people. One-man government is as bad now as in the middle of the Dark Ages. It can never be justified, except by the tenet of superstition and ignorance, "The King can do no wrong."

Now, as to the merits of this bill. It is claimed it is an emergency measure. No emergency exists that this bill will meet. The exportations from the United States in the month of January were the largest exportations to foreign countries in any single month in the history of the United States. It was an abnormal export, and it was an export demanded by the war, and consisted largely of munitions of war and of foodstuffs. We have exported them and there must have been ships to take them. They could not get across by aeroplanes. The ships were here to take them across. The greatest exportations were during the month of January, and they are continuing during the present month. We could not, with Government-owned ships, export those things now if we wanted to do so. Munitions of war are made contraband by Germany. No American bottom can take them out on the ocean without being liable to confiscation. A dispatch from London this afternoon, published in the evening papers, dated at 4.46 p. m., states that Great Britain will announce officially this evening or to-morrow morning that foodstuffs hereafter shipped to Germany will be considered contraband of war. That absolutely removes all possibilities for this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be recreant to my trust as a representative of the great city of New York if I did not rise in my place in opposition to this measure. You have listened to-day to the remarks of my colleague, Mr. METZ, who favors its passage. He is one of the largest manufacturers of dyestuffs in the city of New York and knows much of the difficulties confronting the Nation in the matter of over-sea transportation. He is one of our best citizens and a man who deserves much from the people of his city and State. He is a large importer from Europe and, like many others in his line, has been seriously inconvenienced as a result of the European war.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield now. I will yield later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CALDER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have here resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York at a meeting held recently. This organization is composed of the leading merchants, importers, exporters, manufacturers, and business men of our State, and they protest against the enactment of this legislation. The president of this organization, the Hon. Seth Low, is a former mayor of New York City. I also have resolutions adopted by the Manufacturers and Business Men's Association of New York opposing this bill.

What is it we propose to gain by the enactment of this measure? Shall we add to the visible tonnage by a single ship? And if so, where do we expect to obtain these vessels? It is not proposed in this measure that we shall enter into contracts to build merchant vessels, but are to purchase ships already



in existence. This will not relieve the situation, for the ships that we purchase are at present engaged in carrying freight. Is it intended that we shall purchase the German and Austrian ships now interned in our harbors? There are 66 of these vessels with a total of 518,706 tons gross, and most of them are of the passenger-carrying class. It has been maintained in some quarters that if this bill passes it is not the intention of the Government to buy these interned vessels, and I sincerely trust such is the case. It would be taking an unusual risk in view of the attitude of all of the belligerents on this question. It has been repeated over and over again to-day that the rules of the London convention, to which all of the belligerents subscribe, plainly indicate that they would consider a ship sold subsequent to the war subject to capture if overtaken on the high seas. If these German and Austrian vessels are to be considered, would it not be much better to permit their purchase by individuals? Private capital will be very glad to take them and operate them if they can be placed under our flag without the opposition of the warring powers. If purchased and operated by the Government, there is a possibility of our being involved in grave difficulties. If one of these ships owned by a private individual was to be captured or destroyed, the matter would be one for settlement by the rules of war, and our Government could not be directly involved; but if owned by this Government and captured or destroyed we would be immediately involved, and there is grave probability that it would end in serious complications that might be most disastrous to the peace of this country.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said to-day about the excessive freight rates charged in our over-sea trade. Everyone knows that the rates are higher than ever before and that they are really more than they should be. I am reliably informed that on vessels owned by citizens of Great Britain and France that the freight rates are little higher than under normal conditions prevailing before the war. This is a natural situation. A vessel sailing under the flag of any of the belligerents is subject to capture with all they contain, while ships sailing under a neutral flag are safe, but these unusual rates on neutral ships are to be expected. Many of the English and French merchantmen are being used in connection with their army and navy, and all are subject to capture if encountered by the enemy; so there is every good reason under these circumstances why rates attain their unusual high mark.

But, gentlemen, practically all the great maritime nations of the world except our own are at war. Conditions are extraordinary, and when one stops to consider all of the facts, have we much to complain of? I have heard on the floor to-day of the difficulties that the farmers of the West and South are faced with. We are told of the extraordinary prices charged the grower of wheat and corn for shipping his product. I am advised that these excessive rates are paid by the consumer and that the farmer is receiving an unusually high price. In my city and State an investigation is under way because of the shortage of wheat and the high price of flour. It is maintained that a combination of wheat growers and those interested in the great exchanges of the country are responsible for this condition of affairs. It seems to me that the European war is responsible. The other countries are unable to raise enough to supply their needs, and, naturally, they come to us, the great food-producing nation, to feed them. It has been suggested that it might be well to stop the exportation of foodstuffs, and thereby reduce the freight rates and, incidentally, the cost to the American consumer.

Now I will yield to my colleague, Mr. METZ, for a question. I promised him that I would.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me a question, and I am going to make an explanation.

Mr. CALDER. My time is very short. I can only yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. METZ. How many ships do you suppose the business I am engaged in needs for the transportation of its products to this country?

Mr. CALDER. I should say one ship a month.

Mr. METZ. Five thousand tons will do the whole thing and keep the woolen mills in operation.

Mr. CALDER. I have no desire to intimate that the gentleman is supporting this measure because of any personal interest he may have. I know him too well to believe that he is actuated in this or other matters by his personal interests. I sincerely trust that whatever business he has abroad will go on without serious inconvenience.

Mr. METZ. The gentleman need not worry about me.

Mr. CALDER. I know that my colleague is able to take care of himself.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most unusual proceeding. To-day we are discussing a great measure, establishing a new policy for the Government without reasonable consideration. This bill is to be debated for six hours. It ought to have at least two weeks. Hardly a man on this floor knows the contents of the measure we are asked to vote upon to-day. A careful reading would indicate to me that we will repeal all our navigation laws by passing this bill—measures enacted during all the years of the existence of this country safeguarding the lives and property of the people on the high seas. If for no other reason I would vote against this bill. Having assisted in preparing some of these important navigation laws, I am not willing to vote to repeal them without some knowledge as to what will be substituted in their place and without an opportunity for reasonable debate. There are many other provisions in this bill which should be discussed and open for amendment, and to which careful and deliberate consideration should be given. The bill is brought in here under a special rule as the result of caucus dictation and will be voted upon exactly as reported, without any opportunity for amendment. There is no demand for this legislation. The business men throughout the country realize that if this bill is enacted into law it will simply mean the expenditure of \$40,000,000 of the people's money without appreciable relief to the world's commerce. Yesterday I inquired from the Commissioner of Navigation the amount of tonnage of all the maritime nations, and will print as part of my remarks the number of ships of each nation and their tonnage. This statement indicates that all the gross tonnage of the maritime nations of the earth in 1914 amounted to approximately 50,000,000 tons, and of that amount the tonnage of Austria and Germany amounted to 6,500,000 tons, about one-eighth of the total. The effect of the withdrawal of these two countries from trade has, of course, seriously inconvenienced business.

The operation of steamship lines by the Government is a new departure in this country. It is true that this was undertaken in a limited extent when we took over the Panama line of steamers at the time of the purchase of the rights of the French interests which had the canal under construction. We were compelled to use them for the purpose of carrying supplies necessary in the building of the canal. I venture the statement that a careful examination of the cost of operation will prove that it has been a losing venture as against privately owned and operated steamship lines. One of the important planks in the socialistic platform of 1912 provides for "the collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamship lines, and all other means of social transportation and communication, and all land." Has the Democratic Party in this House committed itself finally to the doctrine of socialism? Is this one of the new ideas that President Wilson has criticized the Republican Party for not having? Is this to be the beginning of a movement whereby this Government shall operate the railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and other means of transportation?

Gentlemen speak of this measure as a temporary one, but they do not attempt to advise us where they are going to get the vessels to operate. It seems to me rather, Mr. Speaker, that we are entering upon a new field of activity. The experiences of the last 20 years have shown us that when we undertake things of this kind we are adding unnecessary expense to the conduct of the business of the Nation, which results in an excessive burden on the people.

I voted for the Alaskan railroad bill although I hesitated in so doing. My reason for voting for it was because it was a new country which contained Government land of great value, that we sorely needed the coal that it is claimed exists there, and we were advised private capital would not invest in an enterprise of this character. I am informed that the appropriation authorized in this year's sundry civil bill is to be used in the purchase of an existing railroad. I have sufficient confidence in the Secretary of the Interior to be sure that he will obtain a good bargain for the Government, but I am satisfied now that I erred when I voted for the measure. When the European war is over, if this bill is passed, the Government merchant ships will be brought in direct competition not only with American privately owned vessels but merchant ships of all the nations of the world. Does anyone believe that with the higher wages and better living conditions required on Government-owned American ships we can hope to compete at a profit? Either we will be compelled to conduct our shipping business at a loss or lay our vessels up. What method shall we pursue to build up our much-needed merchant marine?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is only one of two things to do. First, to give to foreign-built vessels the permanent right to



come in under the American flag, to operate in both the over-sea and coastwise trade under the same conditions as now afforded our own ships, or, second, to follow the policy of Great Britain in granting a subsidy to their mail and merchant lines. I am heartily in favor of the latter. I believe that if we should devote the interest on the \$40,000,000 contemplated in this measure to give Government aid to privately owned lines of vessels we would encourage the building of a merchant marine that would in the end in a large degree take care of at least our South American commerce. Those of us on this side believe in protection to American industries, and in your own Underwood tariff bill, while it is a nonrevenue-producing measure as compared with the Republican system of a protective tariff, nevertheless, in many of its provisions you have sought to take care of special interests, to protect them against foreign competition. The same principle is involved in the building of the merchant marine. We can not hope to succeed until we follow the policy of Government aid.

I have been a Member of this House for 10 years. I had hoped that I might aid in doing something to establish a merchant marine. I can not vote for this measure. It is socialistic. It is apt to involve us in serious trouble with the Governments of Europe now engaged in war with each other and will not appreciably contribute to the relief of the present trying situation. It will be unprofitable from the standpoint of the Government, and will be, I am convinced, a failure.

My attention was called this morning to a speech delivered by President Wilson about three years ago. I believe it was in the spring before his nomination for the Presidency. It occurred at Indianapolis, where he delivered another speech recently, and the meeting was presided over by the then governor, now Vice President Marshall. In the former speech Gov. Wilson spoke with unusual vigor and with compelling force. First, he insisted that all legislation should be conducted under the public eye; that committees should transact their business with wide-open doors; that the public should be freely admitted at all times to hear and see what might transpire in the course of legislation. And yet our history furnishes no parallel to the secrecy that shrouded the preparation of this bill. Upon this measure no hearings have been held in the House. It was formulated behind closed doors and almost wholly in the dark and without one note of protest coming from the White House. Secondly, he inveighed most vigorously against the party caucus in this same speech at Indianapolis and took the position that all the representatives of the people, in both House and Senate, should have the full privilege of debate and amendment and that the individual conscience

should never be bound by caucus domination. Imagine it, gentlemen! He was a candidate then. How things have changed since that day. It seems to me that never in any period of the history of the United States has any great party been so dominated by caucus rule. In the main every great measure which we have considered during the present Congress was formulated behind closed doors, out of view of the public and the minority of this House. The Democratic side has voted at all times its caucus determination, no matter whether or not our view was the correct one. As an evidence of this, take the Federal currency act, which came to the House as a result of caucus. It was amended in one or two small particulars, and went to the Senate with the assurance that it was a perfect measure, meeting the hearty approval of the President, but before it got through the Senate it was amended six hundred times. The President's third pre-election statement was that each of the three coordinate branches of government should be absolutely independent of the other two; that the Executive should never encroach upon or invade the sphere of the others, and that neither should ever tolerate any interference whatever by either of the other two. And yet, neither Jackson, whom the President said in his recent speech he was following, nor Roosevelt, at whom three years ago he was striking, ever interfered more with legislation and its passage than the President has done in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this measure with many gentlemen on the other side of the House. They are opposed to it in their hearts. They doubt its value. Many of them are confident that it is a step in the dark and one that in the end will be a failure, and still they vote for it because of the pressure from the White House.

The business men of the great city of New York, which I have the honor in part to represent, are almost to a man against this measure. They are much better informed on the subject than are we. They know the intricacies of trade and are unlike the President, who in his last Indianapolis speech stated that he had never been in business and therefore could not be prejudiced in the matter.

We are living in difficult times. We are at peace with the world. Let us do nothing that will mar this peace.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation, dated February 15, advising me that on June 30, 1914, there was employed in the coasting trade of the United States 23,562 vessels, of 6,818,363 gross tons.

Mr. Speaker, I shall print here a statement of Lloyds, the great English authority on the merchant marine, indicating the number of vessels engaged in the world's commerce, with their gross and net tonnage.

*Number and net and gross tonnage of steam and sailing vessels of over 100 tons, of the several countries of the world, as recorded in Lloyd's Register for 1914-15.*

Flag.	Steam.			Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	Net tons.	Gross tons.	Number.	Net tons.	Number.	Tonnage.
British:							
United Kingdom.....	8,587	11,545,746	18,892,089	653	364,677	9,240	19,256,766
Colonies.....	1,536	949,386	1,631,617	552	156,666	2,088	1,788,283
Total.....	10,123	12,495,132	20,523,706	1,205	521,343	11,328	21,045,049
American (United States):							
Sea.....	1,113	1,315,976	2,026,908	1,377	943,376	2,490	2,970,284
Northern lakes.....	579	1,704,039	2,260,441	31	92,323	610	2,352,764
Philippine Islands.....	65	25,876	42,729	9	2,417	74	45,146
Total.....	1,757	3,045,891	4,330,078	1,417	1,038,116	3,174	5,368,194
Argentinian.....	244	112,165	188,892	69	32,789	313	221,681
Austro-Hungarian.....	433	653,873	1,062,346	12	3,373	445	1,055,719
Belgian.....	173	218,800	341,025	9	11,099	182	352,124
Brazilian.....	395	185,120	307,607	53	16,322	448	323,929
Chilean.....	91	60,865	96,473	32	19,444	123	125,917
Chinese.....	73	59,255	93,095	2	323	75	93,418
Cuban.....	53	26,334	58,450	4	641	57	59,091
Danish.....	576	454,262	770,430	246	49,751	822	820,181
Dutch.....	709	910,123	1,471,710	97	21,745	806	1,496,455
French.....	1,025	1,099,914	1,922,286	551	397,152	1,576	2,319,438
German.....	2,090	3,116,968	5,134,720	298	324,576	2,388	5,459,296
Greek.....	407	515,549	820,861	78	16,007	485	836,868
Italian.....	637	872,308	1,430,475	523	237,821	1,160	1,668,296
Japanese.....	1,103	1,088,333	1,708,386	.....	.....	1,103	1,708,386
Mexican.....	48	27,328	45,069	9	2,129	57	47,198
Norwegian.....	1,656	1,173,936	1,967,353	535	547,369	2,191	2,504,722
Peruvian.....	19	15,226	28,771	46	23,935	65	52,706
Portuguese.....	105	55,449	92,429	105	28,502	210	120,931
Roumanian.....	34	32,072	56,164	2	678	36	56,842
Russian.....	747	500,352	851,949	507	201,869	1,254	1,053,818
Siamese.....	11	7,741	12,360	.....	.....	11	12,360
Spanish.....	589	537,575	883,926	58	14,897	647	898,823
Swedish.....	1,088	591,382	1,015,364	378	102,722	1,466	1,118,086
Turkish.....	142	68,096	116,317	60	16,841	202	133,158
Uruguayan.....	42	29,472	38,837	16	14,320	58	53,157
Other countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Persia, Salvador, Samoa, Sarawak, Tunis, Venezuela, Zanzibar, etc.....	74	31,161	54,798	80	28,911	154	83,709
Total.....	24,444	27,987,782	45,403,877	6,392	3,685,675	30,836	49,089,552



Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Missouri going to occupy all of his time for one speech? If not, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the record made by this Congress, a Congress pledged to the enactment of legislation to lighten the burdens of the people, I do not know whether to laugh or to cry. You enacted a tariff law that made the high cost of living higher to the consumer. You passed a currency law that increased interest rates to the borrower. Your proverbial economy in expenditures has become the most profligate extravagance in administration of the country ever witnessed. No wonder our people are staggering under the burdens of taxation. Business is stagnant. Industry is paralyzed. You seem to recognize that the patient is sick, but you do not seem to have sense enough to prescribe the remedy. You have the captain of the team, as the President calls himself, and you seem to think that legislating for 100,000,000 of your countrymen is mere boys' play.

We are told that we have no ships, and that this is the reason for this measure; yet during the month of December, 1913, we sent abroad of our corn, our wheat, our oats, and our barley only 5,000,000 bushels. In December, 1914, we sent abroad over 41,000,000 bushels of these cereals. Apparently we have no difficulty in securing an abundance of ships to carry our produce abroad.

But some one says that ocean rates are high. I would be very glad to vote for a bill to bring about a reduction in those rates. How about that side of the Chamber, whose party in convention in Baltimore adopted a platform promising cheaper railway rates? In the Interstate Commerce case where the eastern roads were asking for an increase of 5 per cent, the president of the New York Central lines testified that in 1913 that after setting aside all that was necessary for depreciation, and after setting aside \$11,000,000 to the surplus fund, they still had enough to pay 11 per cent on the entire capitalization of the road. The president of the Pennsylvania Railroad testified that in 1913, after setting aside a sufficient fund to cover all of the depreciation charges they still had net earnings sufficient to pay more than 9.6 per cent on the total capitalization of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Yet, notwithstanding such magnificent earnings, the President of the United States, on September 11 wrote a letter which appears in the New York Times of that date under the following headlines:

President asks aid for railroads—Calls country's attention to the necessity of giving them every possible help—Finds their needs vital—In open letter to Frank Trumbull he insists their credits must be sustained—May seek rate increase—Reopening of interstate ruling of August 1 probably will be asked by eastern lines.

The President says to Mr. Trumbull:

Since you read it to me yesterday I have read again the statement you made on behalf of the committee of railroad presidents whom I had the pleasure of meeting and conferring with at my office. It is a lucid statement of plain truths.

You asked me to call the attention of the country to the imperative need that railway credits be sustained and the railroads helped in every possible way, whether by private cooperative effort or by the action, wherever feasible, of Government agencies, and I am glad to do so, because I think the need very real.

I am confident that there will be active and earnest cooperation in this matter, perhaps the one common interest of our whole industrial life.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Active cooperation! Active cooperation with whom? With whom could the President cooperate? Who had the power to grant the increase? The Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission alone. The President wanted freight rates increased for railroads that were earning 11 per cent in 1913 after they had paid all operating expenses, charged off all that was necessary for depreciation, and set aside \$11,000,000 for the surplus fund. And yet you gentlemen on that side now claim that you are in favor of bearing down on the trusts and putting them out of business and of bringing lower freight rates to the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But gentlemen say, "Oh, we would put the Ship Trust out of business. How about the Ship Trust?" Are you anxious to put it out of business? If so, you have the power through the Attorney General. In a previous Congress I voted against a ship subsidy. I will vote against it again. But before I would vote for this bill I would willingly vote for a ship subsidy. With such a law we would know what it would cost the country. Then I would know that I was voting for the Shipping Trust and would admit it. But with this bill enacted into law, who can say what the cost to the Government will be? You gentle-

men talk about a Ship Trust, when you know, if you have read the report of the Attorney General, that the only Ship Trust he can find that is engaged in commerce is the German-American Packet Co., and that is one of the companies that you intend to help by buying their interned ships. They can not use these ships; we should not; but you propose to help this trust out of a very tight place by buying their interned ships. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the light of the testimony of the Attorney General, may I ask who is in favor of or is helping the greatest Shipping Trust in the world? [Applause on the Republican side.] Yes; I should like to see some law enacted that would reduce the rates on ocean freights. I would vote for a bill to-day to build ships auxiliary to our Navy. I would vote for a bill to-day to put to work a few out of millions of my countrymen who are out of work. I would gladly vote to set them to building ships, instead of buying interned ships, as you propose to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But you say this is an emergency measure. We have a law, enacted by Congress a few years ago, that not a dollar can be paid out of the Treasury unless it is appropriated in specific terms.

If you will turn to section 7 of this bill, you will find that the \$30,000,000 is not appropriated. Not a penny of that \$30,000,000 is appropriated, but you have done a most unusual thing—a thing that Congress should never do. You have authorized the Secretary of the Treasury not only to sell Government bonds to buy or build ships but, by this provision, you authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to trade the bonds of your country and mine—Panama bonds of the value of \$30,000,000—for old ships. He is to be the judge of the value of the old ships traded for and the price at which the bonds are to be accepted. Ordinarily you would offer these bonds to the public and sell them to the highest bidder; not so in this bill. You are proposing now that the Secretary of the Treasury may exchange these bonds for ships. You may have a very high and exalted opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury; but I submit that our American crown prince, the Secretary of the Treasury, should not be permitted to trade our Government bonds in this way for any merchandise.

No; let us refuse this un-American request; let us do what was finally determined by the Committee on Naval Affairs to do; let us build these ships. It was determined by that committee, after full hearing, that after the lapse of seven or eight months there could be one ship produced of from 8,000 to 10,000 tons capacity, and that thereafter two ships could be turned out every month by American labor. You say this is an emergency measure, and you also say the Secretary of the Treasury will trade the Panama Government bonds for old ships. Then you must admit that there will be no funds authorized with which he can purchase ships except the \$10,000,000 appropriated in section 15 of this bill. If such an emergency exists, why wait until after the next Congress convenes in December before appropriating this \$30,000,000? If an emergency exists satisfy it now by adequate appropriation; if an emergency does not exist, then let us drop the consideration of a measure that may involve us in international difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, \$40,000,000 may not be a large amount of money. The way that side of the House has appropriated money, it does not so regard it; but, Mr. Speaker, \$40,000,000 is too much money for us to pay for an international quarrel. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is not the expenditure of money alone of which I complain, but it is the great risk that we take in buying these interned ships. Let us understand that if we are to become involved in war with any European powers it will be because we have rushed headlong into the shipping business at a time when prudence and common sense would dictate to us that we should attend to our own business. This is not the time to embark in this industry.

The Democratic mayor of New York has called the President's attention to the fact that the wheat supply of this country is becoming exhausted and that the price of bread in this country is becoming a problem, but even that does not seem to prevent gentlemen on that side from rushing blindly into this program to buy these ships from the only Shipping Trust that exists in all the world and give them Panama bonds in payment for them. I shall vote against the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the limited time granted for debate. I have noticed before the six hours expired the remarkable effect of the debate. When this debate opened on this side there was a strenuous charge that the



bill was not a House of Representatives bill, but that it was a bill originating in the Executive Mansion. No sooner was the charge made than the denial came from the Democratic side. Within the last hour of the debate so much progress was made that in Addisonian prose the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] arose and boastfully said that this bill is a President Wilson bill. And, as if to clinch the admission, our able poetic friend from Connecticut arose and in his piquant rhymes and near poetry boasted this bill to be the bill of President Wilson.

So that the debate has established that one fact. I have considerable faith in the knowledge of the man who produced that bill; and when I heard within the last few days mooted about the Capitol the charge that the Shipping Trust was the obstruction to the passage of this bill, I submitted a question to the Department of Justice, officered by the appointees of the President of the United States, asking that department what actions had been begun against the so-called Shipping Trust, how far the actions had proceeded, and how many convictions there had been, and this is the answer:

Referring to your letter of the 10th instant, three cases under the Federal antitrust law have been instituted in the southern district of New York against alleged combinations of ocean steamship lines, in none of which was the Government successful in the lower courts.

The Department of Justice saw fit to begin these cases. They were tried before the courts of the United States by the best talent this administration could present, and he makes the statement that he was unable to obtain convictions in any of the cases he had selected for prosecution. He goes on to add that he will take the cases to the Supreme Court.

The case against the Hamburg-American Line and others, decided October 13, 1914, is now pending on appeal in the Supreme Court; and the cases against the American-Asiatic Steamship Co. and others and the Prince Line (Ltd.) and others, both decided February 3, 1915, will be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The admission by the Department of Justice that the existing cases selected by it have thus far failed; and the charge that is made so promiscuously from the other side of the House has no foundation whatever, so far as the present is concerned. No man with confidence in the Department of Justice and the courts of this land will make the charge until they have succeeded in establishing a conviction.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SLOAN. I can not yield. I want to say that I object to this bill because I believe it an indirect and objectionable declaration of war. The White House induced the Members of this House last spring to make a declaration of war, not against a great nation, but against an individual. Then was projected our fleet against an officer of another Government. It captured the greatest port of that nation, drove out the head of the only part of that nation where American life, limb, and property were safe and left anarchy throughout the Republic of Mexico, overrun by the outlaw followers of unstable Carranza, the blood-thirsty Zapata, and the villainous Villa.

We have been furnished from the same source heretofore a great many ships, but they are all hardships. [Laughter.] They have fallen upon our National Treasury, upon our laborers, and upon our industries. Plenty hardships have been furnished us, and we do not want any ships of commerce forced upon us from the same source.

In nearly every speech I have heard to-day on that side there were crocodile tears shed for the producers of the land and the farmers who desired to send their products abroad. The bill which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] said was substantially the same bill as the one now being considered on page 2 says that the purpose of the bill is to stimulate shipping between the ports of the United States and South and Central America. What does that mean to the American farmer? It means that every ship that goes from the American ports to South America will carry back—what? Not manufactured articles; but they will carry back grain, corn, wheat, alfalfa, beef and other meat, as they have been during the last year, in great cargoes from Argentina. In the report I find here in support of the Alexander bill a statement that there were 16,000,000 bushels of corn came in last year.

It was said that was only a negligible quantity, and yet, according to the evidence submitted before the Committee on Agriculture in the grain-grading hearings, and uncontradicted, although 50 grain dealers were there, it reduced the price of our corn to our producers at least 10 cents a bushel. Every man who knows anything about grain knows that to be absolutely true, and the farmers of the United States are not interested in having first placed upon the free list the products of the farm, and then to put our hands into the Treasury of the United States, or rather strain the credit of the United States, to buy ships to haul grain from South America to the American ports and there compete directly with the products of our

farms. We lost in revenue enough on those 16,000,000 bushels of corn to have kept our Treasury going for three days, and that would have been a fine breathing spell both for the Treasury and for you in these times. The party which has spurned the farmer and scorned the farmer in all its legislation will not gain much favor in prescribing this specious and dangerous measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN.] [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the pending bill, because, first, it is not needed, and, second, it is dangerous. It is said that freight rates on the ocean are too high and that the Shipping Trust controls the vessels. If the Shipping Trust controls the vessels, from whom will we buy our vessels? From the Shipping Trust? If the Shipping Trust are making the enormous profits out of freight rates to-day, why should they sell their vessels to the Government of the United States or the shipping board? If, as was said by one gentleman here, a vessel is making its cost out of its rates in a year, at what price will they sell that vessel? I have waited in vain to-day for any answer to these questions. Who will sell the vessels to the United States? Is it proposed to expend \$30,000,000 in buying vessels from the Shipping Trust and take those vessels which the Shipping Trust will give up? It certainly must be plain that if a trust controls the freight rates on the ocean and controls the vessels, there will be no vessels for us to buy, unless we are willing to pay exorbitant prices for old ships which are practically old hulks. [Applause on the Republican side.] How, then, will the passage of this bill reduce freight rates? Under the terms of this bill you can not build any vessels to meet the emergency which you say now exists, because that will take time, and before the ships can be constructed this emergency will have passed away. It is said that we can not send our produce abroad rapidly enough.

If all of the wheat in the United States to-day, or four-fifths of it, or one-half of it, could to-day be put on the Atlantic on its way to Europe, the price of wheat would have the bottom drop out of it. If we send our wheat abroad too rapidly, it will put the price of wheat down so that we will not get as much for all of the wheat as we would if one-half of it is sent more slowly. [Applause.] And if to-day we could send abroad all of the cotton that lies in the ports of the country, the price of cotton would break, and you would not get 5 cents a pound for it abroad. You maintain the price of these products abroad largely because there has been and is some delay in endeavoring to ship abroad at the present high prices. Otherwise, you would break the price.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill because it is dangerous. You can not buy the vessels from the Shipping Trust unless you pay enormous prices, and is it proposed, then, to buy the interned vessels of belligerent nations? Everyone knows that the moment we buy one of the interned vessels and load upon that vessel foodstuffs which England has declared to be conditional contraband and which she will not permit to be sent to Germany, we are treading upon dangerous ground. I believe that the President of the United States is sincere in his desire to preserve the absolute neutrality of this country as between the warring nations. In that respect I stand with him and behind him. I want to keep this country out of war [applause] and out of provocation for war. Of course, if we reach the point where we must fight for our rights, we will all do it with enthusiasm, but we do not wish to reach that point.

In this fight between the allies and Germany and Austria we know that in the end these nations, in a desperate struggle for existence, will not be too careful in their treatment of the rights of neutrals. We should make every effort to keep out of trouble, to keep our nose out of the affairs of other people. [Applause.] We should set ourselves absolutely against any kind of alliances or entanglements which may bring us to the point where we may have to vote for or against war. This is the great opportunity of the United States, while these other great powers are warring, to reach preeminence through peace. We must preserve peace, and we ought not under any circumstances to take a step which, whether it actually leads to war or not, leads to difficulties. We can send our foodstuffs, we can send our cotton, abroad as rapidly as they will be taken up at good prices in other countries. We do not need this bill. If we pass it and it is put into operation, we shall run the risk of embroiling our country in foreign difficulties and perhaps in war. Let us remember to be patriots first, and to uphold the rights of our country peaceably, and keep out of trouble. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to detain the House at any length. If I were inclined to traverse the ground which gentlemen on the other side have endeavored



to cover and to correct the misstatements—the reckless misstatements—made by them, I would require far more time than is at my disposal. I can understand partisan feeling. I am sometimes inspired by it myself, but I have never stooped so low as to be absolutely indifferent to the truth when undertaking to criticize the adversary party. Take it for granted that this bill did originate at the White House. Could it have originated at a better source? [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is possible you gentlemen on the other side do not have that high regard for the gentleman who is now the Chief Magistrate of the United States which is entertained by the gentlemen on this side. But I want to tell you that in lofty patriotism, in scholarship, in statesmanship there is not another man in the United States to-day better or greater than Woodrow Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But it is not becoming, it is undignified, it is contemptible for you to try to slur him. It is beneath the dignity of any American citizen [applause on the Democratic side], much less the minority in this body, that in times past has represented a great political party in this country. Some of you say you are in favor of Government ownership, but this bill does not go far enough. Some of you are in favor of subsidy, some of you are not.

Gentlemen, is there anything in the situation in this country to-day growing out of the war in Europe to arrest the attention of the American people and demand a remedy? Is there anything in the situation that suggests to you the necessity of an American merchant marine? Have you given any thought to that subject, or have you been so diligent in your criticism of the President of the United States that you have overlooked what to my mind is one of the greatest problems before the American people to-day demanding solution? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regard an American merchant marine as an essential part of the national defense. It has been my aspiration ever since I came to Congress to be an humble instrument of my party to do something to rehabilitate the American merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While my party was in the minority and I was serving on the committee under the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], I cooperated with him in every rational way to help solve this great problem, but I was unwilling to support such measures as the Humphrey bill, which contemplated the expenditure of about \$5,000,000 a year to be paid to about 20 ships belonging to certain favorite ship lines. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MURDOCK. And under a 10-year contract.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader, quite in contrast with his associates on that side of the House, says that he believes the President of the United States is intent on maintaining or observing our duty as a neutral Nation; that he will not knowingly do anything that will compromise us as a Nation or involve us in war with one or the other of the belligerents. That is a sentiment worthy of the gentleman from Illinois [applause], but it is in contrast with and a reproach to every gentleman on that side who has spoken to-day in criticism of the President.

Mr. MANN. I represent the sentiment of every gentleman on this side; all of them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If that is true, if the gentleman from Illinois reflects the true sentiment of the gentlemen on that side of the House, and believes in good faith what he says, what is this talk that we have had to-day about the risk of involving ourselves in war if this bill should become a law? The President of the United States is charged with the administration of this law. No ship can be purchased without his consent. The representatives of all the belligerent nations are here, and before any ship is purchased we can ascertain whether or not they will object to that purchase. But, gentlemen, we have heard much about the duties, our obligations as a neutral. Why, gentlemen, I can not understand why you emphasize our duties, and are seemingly indifferent to our rights.

In years past the Republican Party was wont to point to the splendid flag yonder as an emblem of the greatest and the freest Nation on earth and it was their boast that under its ample folds we should not only observe our obligations but dared assert our rights. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet timorous, cowardly you seem to be now, and voicing the sentiment of the Shipping Trust, you do not want us to buy any ships nor to assert any rights we may have, notwithstanding the war in Europe, for which we are not responsible, has paralyzed our commerce. It is possible that there are no ships to be purchased except the interned ships. It is possible if we should buy those ships we might not be permitted to use them in the trade with Europe. That we would be guilty of a violation of any of our duties as a neutral if we should use those vessels in the South American, the South African, or the Far Eastern

trade I have never yet heard anyone assert. But assuming that to be true, and assuming that we could not buy them, and that under the provisions of this bill we could do no more than utilize the vessels of the Panama Railroad Co., the Army transports, and such naval auxiliaries as might be used for auxiliary purposes, so much the pity, because then the remedy would be that much adequately less. But it is worthy of an effort on our part to do all we can to relieve the situation, and this administration could not excuse itself to the American people unless it should do all in its power to relieve the American people from the extortionate freight rates of the ships now engaged in the foreign trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I can not imagine how you gentlemen can be so indifferent, and if I understand your position, and I undertake to sum it up now, it is that notwithstanding freight rates on cotton, wheat, lumber, and other commodities for export have increased from 500 to 1,100 per cent, you regard the situation with absolute indifference and excuse yourselves upon the ground that the foreigner pays the freight. Gentlemen, I investigated the Shipping Trust by direction of this House. I was engaged in that task for more than two years. I found that there was not a single trade area in the world that was not controlled by the Shipping Trust. I found that within three years prior to 1913 ocean freight rates had increased from 50 to 200 per cent, whereas the costs of operation had not appreciably increased at all. I have here a statement of British lines for a number of years past showing their dividends during that time were from 10 to 100 per cent per annum, and each year they accumulated a large surplus.

And yet you say we should regard this situation with indifference; that it does not call for a remedy. I think it is of the utmost importance to us as a Nation if we would extend our foreign trade that we must have reasonable ocean freight rates in order to do so. We can not rest upon the assumption that the foreigner pays the freight. If that logic is true, the farmer might be indifferent as to the rate upon his goods from the farm to the market in the city. But, gentlemen, as I said, it is not my purpose to extend this discussion. The gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, some time before the gentleman concludes will he yield to a question about one of the amendments?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; but I would rather not do so just at this point.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], who, after my friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], is one of the fiercest partisans in this House, had much to say in the way of harsh criticism about the provision of this bill that the Government should use \$30,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds with which to buy ships.

Now, I have before me a copy of a bill introduced in the Senate of the United States by the senior Senator from Iowa. The bill I hold in my hand was introduced in this House by my good friend from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. This bill was referred to my committee, and it reads in part:

That the President is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase or construction, at a cost not exceeding in the aggregate \$30,000,000, vessels which shall be both suitable for naval auxiliaries and for use in foreign commerce. In order to provide a fund for the payment of vessels so to be purchased and the cost of the construction of vessels so to be built and equipped hereunder the President may issue and sell or use any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to an amount not exceeding \$30,000,000.

The language in the Towner bill is almost identical with the language in the pending bill, and provides for the purchase of ships by issue of Panama Canal bonds.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The second amendment proposes to strike out of the original bill the word "shall," in line 5, on page 2, and insert the word "to." I think that is an inadvertent mistake. The effect of that would be to pay civilian officers on these ships the pay and allowances of naval officers. I think the gentleman has plenty of time, and I will ask him if he will let me read it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill without the amendment reads:

Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired lists, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary, shall be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines.

I stop there at present. Now, the amendment is to strike out "shall" and insert the word "to," and make it read this way:

Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, and such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired



list, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary to be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines, and retired officers of the Navy so employed at sea or on shore shall, in all respects, be held and considered to be in an active duty status, and shall receive the pay and allowances of officers of the active list of the same rank and length of service.

The effect of the amendment would be to pay the civilian officers the pay and allowances of naval officers, whereas the gentleman only means the pay of officers on the retired list put on active duty with the rank and pay of officers on the active list.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman may be correct.

The gentleman has spoken about the division on this side of the House, and that the majority is being coerced from the White House. Gentlemen, in a few minutes we are going to give you an exhibition of solidarity. If it is the result of coercion from the White House, I hope it will always continue, because under this administration we have had more constructive legislation than at any other time in the last 25 years. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Missouri concluded?

Mr. ALEXANDER. While that is a mistake to which the gentleman from Illinois has called attention, it can be corrected later. I call for a vote now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It was reported this morning, but the Clerk will report it again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 3, after the word "that," by inserting "with the approval of the President."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—yeas 221, noes 98.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands tellers and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] demands the yeas and nays. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays, 31, answered "present" 5, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 74.]

YEAS—301.

Abercrombie	Chandler, N. Y.	Frear	Hulings
Adair	Church	French	Hull
Adamson	Clancy	Gallagher	Humphrey, Wash.
Aiken	Clark, Fla.	Gallivan	Humphreys, Miss.
Alexander	Claypool	Gardner	Igoe
Allen	Cline	Garner	Jacoway
Anthony	Coady	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.
Ashbrook	Collier	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, S. C.
Aswell	Connelly, Kans.	George	Johnson, Utah
Bailey	Connolly, Iowa	Gill	Johnson, Wash.
Baker	Conry	Gillett	Keating
Baltz	Cooper	Gilmore	Kelley, Mich.
Barchfeld	Cox	Gittins	Kelly, Pa.
Barkley	Cramton	Glass	Kennedy, Conn.
Barton	Crisp	Goeke	Kennedy, Iowa
Bathrick	Crosser	Goldfogle	Kent
Beakes	Cullop	Good	Kettner
Bell, Cal.	Dale	Goodwin, Ark.	Key, Ohio
Bell, Ga.	Decker	Gordon	Kiess, Pa.
Blackmon	Deitrick	Goulden	Kinkaid
Booher	Dershem	Graham, Ill.	Kirkpatrick
Borland	Dickinson	Gray	Knowland, J. R.
Bowdle	Difenderfer	Green, Iowa	Konop
Britten	Dillon	Greene, Mass.	Korbly
Brockson	Dixon	Greene, Vt.	Lafferty
Brodbeck	Donohoe	Gregg	La Follette
Brown, N. Y.	Donovan	Griffin	Lazaro
Brown, W. Va.	Doolittle	Gudger	Lee, Ga.
Browning	Doremus	Guernsey	Lee, Pa.
Bruckner	Doughton	Hamilton, Mich.	Lenroot
Brumbaugh	Driscoll	Hamlin	Leshner
Bryan	Dupré	Hardy	Lever
Buchanan, Ill.	Eagan	Harris	Levy
Buchanan, Tex.	Edmonds	Harrison	Lewis, Md.
Bulkley	Esch	Haugen	Lieb
Burke, S. Dak.	Estopinal	Hay	Lindbergh
Burke, Wis.	Farr	Hayden	Lindquist
Burnett	Fergusson	Hedin	Linthicum
Byrnes, S. C.	Ferris	Helm	Lloyd
Byrns, Tenn.	Fess	Helvering	Lobeck
Callaway	Fields	Henry	Logue
Campbell	Finley	Hill	Loneragan
Candler, Miss.	Fitzgerald	Hinds	McAndrews
Cantor	FitzHenry	Hinebaugh	McKellar
Cantrill	Flood, Va.	Holland	McKenzie
Caraway	Floyd, Ark.	Houston	MacDonald
Carlin	Foster	Howard	Maguire, Nebr.
Carter	Fowler	Howell	Mahan
Casey	Francis	Hughes, Ga.	Manahan

Mann	Peters	Seldomridge	Tavener
Mapes	Peterson	Shackelford	Taylor, Ala.
Martin	Phelan	Sherley	Taylor, Ark.
Miller	Porter	Sherwood	Taylor, Colo.
Mitchell	Post	Sims	Temple
Montague	Pou	Sinnott	Ten Eyck
Moon	Powers	Sisson	Thomas
Morin	Price	Slayden	Thomson, Ill.
Morrison	Prouty	Sloan	Towner
Moss, Ind.	Quin	Small	Townsend
Mott	Ragsdale	Smith, Md.	Tribble
Mulkey	Rainey	Smith, Saml. W.	Vaughan
Murdock	Raker	Smith, Minn.	Vinson
Murray	Rauch	Smith, N. Y.	Volmer
Neeley, Kans.	Rayburn	Smith, Tex.	Walsh
Neely, W. Va.	Reilly, Conn.	Stafford	Watkins
Nelson	Reilly, Wis.	Stedman	Watson
Norton	Riordan	Stephens, Cal.	Weaver
O'Hair	Roberts, Mass.	Stephens, Miss.	Webb
Oldfield	Rogers	Stephens, Nebr.	Whitacre
Padgett	Rothermel	Stephens, Tex.	White
Page, N. C.	Rouse	Stevens, N. H.	Williams
Paige, Mass.	Rubey	Stone	Wingo
Palmer	Rucker	Stringer	Young, Tex.
Park	Russell	Summers	
Parker, N. J.	Scott	Taggart	
Patton, Pa.	Scully	Talcott, N. Y.	

NAYS—31.

Anderson	Griest	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Borchers	Hamilton, N. Y.	Madden	Steenerson
Browne, Wis.	Hawley	Mondell	Sutherland
Butler	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore	Switzer
Calder	Kennedy, R. I.	Morgan, Okla.	Volstead
Curry	Kindel	Parker, N. Y.	Woods
Drukker	Langham	Slomp	Young, N. Dak.
Fordney	Langley	Smith, Idaho	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Beall, Tex.	Davenport	Dies	Metz
Carew			

NOT VOTING—86.

Ainey	Faison	McClellan	Stevens, Minn.
Austin	Falconer	McGillcuddy	Stout
Avis	Gard	McGuire, Okla.	Talbot, Md.
Barnhart	Gerry	Maher	Taylor, N. Y.
Bartholdt	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, La.	Thacher
Bartlett	Gorman	Moss, W. Va.	Thompson, Okla.
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Nolan, J. I.	Treadway
Burgess	Hamill	O'Brien	Tuttle
Burke, Pa.	Hart	Oglesby	Underhill
Carr	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Cary	Helgesen	Patten, N. Y.	Vare
Copley	Hensley	Platt	Walker
Danforth	Hobson	Plumley	Wallin
Davis	Hoxworth	Reed	Walters
Dent	Jones	Roberts, Nev.	Whaley
Dooling	Kahn	Rupley	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keister	Sabath	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagle	Kitchin	Saunders	Winslow
Edwards	Kreider	Sells	Witherspoon
Elder	L'Engle	Shreve	Woodruff
Evans	Lewis, Pa.	Sparkman	
Fairchild	Loft	Stanley	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. WHALEY (for) with Mr. DAVENPORT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. ELDER with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. CARR with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. METZ with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. RUPLEY with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. L'ENGLE with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. CARY.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. WALTERS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the second amendment.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, that was to strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to," was it not?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Debate is not in order.

Mr. WEBB. I was asking for information.



The SPEAKER. Yes; on line 5, page 3, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 212, noes 85.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for tellers. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three gentlemen have arisen for tellers—a sufficient number—and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 159, noes 60.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the second amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 100, answered "present" 3, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 75.]

YEAS—230.

Abercrombie	Donohoe	Hull	Raker
Adair	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Adamson	Doolittle	Igoe	Rayburn
Aiken	Doremus	Jacoway	Relly, Conn.
Alexander	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Relly, Wis.
Allen	Driscoll	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan
Ashbrook	Dupré	Keating	Rothermel
Aswell	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Rouse
Bailey	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Rubey
Baker	Estopinal	Kettner	Rucker
Baltz	Evans	Key, Ohio	Russell
Barkley	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Saunders
Bathrick	Ferris	Kitchin	Scott
Beakes	Fields	Konop	Seldomridge
Bell, Ga.	Finley	Korbly	Shackleford
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Lafferty	Sherley
Booher	FitzHenry	Lazaro	Sherwood
Borchers	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Sims
Borland	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Sisson
Bowdle	Foster	Leshner	Slayden
Brockson	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Md.
Brodbeck	Francis	Levy	Smith, N. Y.
Brown, N. Y.	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Tex.
Brown, W. Va.	Gallivan	Lieb	Stanley
Bruckner	Garner	Linthicum	Stedman
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Stephens, Miss.
Bryan	Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Stephens, Nebr.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gill	Logue	Stephens, Tex.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gilmore	Loneragan	Stevens, N. H.
Bulkley	Gittins	McAndrews	Stone
Burke, Wis.	Glass	McKellar	Stringer
Burnett	Goeke	MacDonald	Summers
Byrnes, S. C.	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Taggart
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Mitchell	Taylner
Cantor	Goulden	Montague	Taylor, Ala.
Caraway	Graham, Ill.	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Carlin	Gray	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Gregg	Moss, Ind.	Ten Eyck
Casey	Griffin	Mulkey	Thomas
Church	Gudger	Murdock	Townsend
Clancy	Hamlin	Murray	Tribble
Claypool	Hardy	Neeley, Kans.	Vaughan
Cline	Harris	Neely, W. Va.	Vinson
Coady	Harrison	O'Hair	Vollmer
Collier	Haugen	Oldfield	Walsh
Connelly, Kans.	Hay	Padgett	Watkins
Conry	Hayden	Page, N. C.	Watson
Cox	Heflin	Palmer	Weaver
Crisp	Helm	Park	Webb
Cullop	Helvering	Peterson	Whitacre
Dale	Hill	Phelan	White
Decker	Holland	Porter	Williams
Deitrick	Houston	Post	Wingo
Dershem	Howard	Pou	Witherspoon
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Price	Young, Tex.
Difenderfer	Hulings	Quin	
Dixon		Rainey	

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Dillon	Guernsey	Kinkaid
Anthony	Drukker	Hamilton, Mich.	Knowland, J. B.
Barchfeld	Edmonds	Hamilton, N. Y.	La Follette
Barton	Esch	Hawley	Langham
Bell, Cal.	Farr	Hinds	Langley
Britten	Fess	Hinebaugh	Lenroot
Browne, Wis.	Fordney	Howell	Lindbergh
Browning	Frear	Hughes, W. Va.	Lindquist
Burke, S. Dak.	French	Humphrey, Wash.	McKenzie
Butler	Gardner	Johnson, Utah	McLaughlin
Calder	Gillett	Johnson, Wash.	Madden
Callaway	Good	Kelley, Mich.	Manahan
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Kennedy, Iowa	Mann
Cooper	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, R. I.	Mapes
Cramton	Greene, Vt.	Kiess, Pa.	Martin
Curry	Griest	Kindel	Miller

Mondell  
Moore  
Morgan, Okla.  
Morin  
Moss, W. Va.  
Mott  
Nelson  
Norton  
Paige, Mass.

Parker, N. J.  
Parker, N. Y.  
Patton, Pa.  
Peters  
Platt  
Powers  
Prouty  
Roberts, Mass.  
Rogers

Sinnott  
Siemp  
Sloan  
Smith, Idaho  
Smith, J. M. C.  
Smith, Minn.  
Smith, Saml. W.  
Stafford  
Steenerson

Stephens, Cal.  
Sutherland  
Switzer  
Temple  
Thomson, Ill.  
Towner  
Volstead  
Woods  
Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Beall, Tex.

Carew

Metz

NOT VOTING—90.

Ainey  
Austin  
Avis  
Barnhart  
Bartholdt  
Bartlett  
Broussard  
Burgess  
Burke, Pa.  
Campbell  
Cantrill  
Carr  
Cary  
Clark, Fla.  
Connolly, Iowa  
Copley  
Crosser  
Danforth  
Davenport  
Davis  
Dent  
Dies  
Dooling

Dunn  
Edwards  
Elder  
Fairchild  
Faison  
Falconer  
Gard  
George  
Gerry  
Godwin, N. C.  
Gorman  
Graham, Pa.  
Hamill  
Hart  
Hayes  
Helgesen  
Hensley  
Hobson  
Hoxworth  
Jones  
Kahn  
Keister  
Kent

Kreider  
L'Engle  
Lewis, Pa.  
Loft  
McClellan  
McGillicuddy  
McGuire, Okla.  
Maher  
Morgan, La.  
Nolan, J. I.  
O'Brien  
Oglesby  
O'Shaunessy  
Patten, N. Y.  
Plumley  
Ragsdale  
Reed  
Roberts, Nev.  
Rupley  
Sabath  
Scully  
Sells  
Shreve

Small  
Sparkman  
Stevens, Minn.  
Stout  
Talbot, Md.  
Taylor, N. Y.  
Thacher  
Thompson, Okla.  
Treadway  
Tuttle  
Underhill  
Underwood  
Vare  
Walker  
Wallin  
Walters  
Whaley  
Wilson, Fla.  
Wilson, N. Y.  
Winslow  
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. PATEN of New York with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. COWLEY.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall of the House listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was attending an important committee meeting.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the rule of the House observed which prohibits Members gathering around the desk during a roll call.

The SPEAKER. They were not interfering with the roll call.

Mr. MANN. The rule says they shall not be at the desk.

The SPEAKER. That is true. They were consulting with the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. I can not help that; it was during the roll call.

The SPEAKER. It is all over. It does not make a bit of difference. [Laughter and applause.]

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider—well, I will not.

Mr. SHERLEY. You can not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ALEXANDER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The amendment that is now being read was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and was read. Is it in order now to read the amendment again except by unanimous consent? It has been read once and considered, and is pending under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point made by the gentleman from Missouri is well taken.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then I object to the further reading of it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. In what regard?

Mr. MANN. There are 13 sections in the amendment, 13 separate propositions, besides a dozen or so other propositions which are divisible. I only ask for a division of the sections.

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly the gentleman is right. The Clerk will report the first section, so that Members will know what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first subdivision.



The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm, or individual citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual, party to such charter or lease, shall violate the provisions of the same. The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, section 5.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 171, noes 77.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers and the gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 100, answered "present" 4, not voting 96.

[Roll No. 76.]

YEAS—223.

Abercrombie	Carlin	FitzHenry	Howard
Adair	Carter	Flood, Va.	Hughes, Ga.
Adamson	Casey	Floyd, Ark.	Hull
Aiken	Church	Foster	Humphreys, Miss.
Alexander	Clancy	Francis	Igoe
Allen	Clark, Fla.	Gallagher	Jacoway
Ashbrook	Claypool	Gallivan	Johnson, Ky.
Aswell	Cline	Garner	Johnson, S. C.
Bailey	Coady	Garrett, Tenn.	Keating
Baker	Collier	Garrett, Tex.	Kelly, Pa.
Baltz	Connelly, Kans.	Gill	Kennedy, Conn.
Barkley	Connolly, Iowa	Gilmore	Kent
Bathrick	Conry	Gittins	Kettner
Beakes	Cox	Glass	Key, Ohio
Bell, Ga.	Crisp	Goeke	Kirkpatrick
Blackmon	Cullop	Goldfogle	Konop
Booher	Dale	Goodwin, Ark.	Korby
Borland	Decker	Gordon	Lafferty
Bowdle	Deitrick	Gorman	Lazarus
Brockson	Dershem	Goulden	Lee, Ga.
Brodbeck	Dickinson	Gray	Lee, Pa.
Brown, N. Y.	Dixon	Gregg	Lesher
Bruckner	Donohoe	Griffin	Lever
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Gudger	Levy
Bryan	Dooling	Hamlin	Lewis, Md.
Buchanan, Ill.	Doolittle	Hardy	Lieb
Buchanan, Tex.	Doremus	Harrison	Linthicum
Bulkley	Doughton	Hay	Lloyd
Burke, Wis.	Driscoll	Hayden	Lobeck
Burnett	Eagan	Healin	Logue
Byrnes, S. C.	Eagle	Helm	Longeran
Byrns, Tenn.	Evans	Helvering	McAndrews
Candler, Miss.	Fergusson	Henry	McKellar
Cantor	Ferris	Hill	MacDonald
Cantrill	Fields	Holland	Maguire, Nebr.
Caraway	Finley	Houston	Mahan

Mitchell	Post	Sherwood	Taylor, Ark.
Montague	Pou	Sims	Taylor, Colo.
Moon	Price	Sisson	Ten Eyck
Morgan, La.	Quinn	Slayden	Thomas
Morrison	Rainey	Small	Townsend
Moss, Ind.	Raker	Smith, Md.	Tribble
Mulkey	Rauch	Smith, N. Y.	Vaughan
Murdock	Rayburn	Smith, Tex.	Vinson
Murray	Reilly, Conn.	Stedman	Vollmer
Neeley, Kans.	Reilly, Wis.	Stephens, Miss.	Waish
Neely, W. Va.	Riordan	Stephens, Nebr.	Walters
O'Hair	Rothermel	Stephens, Tex.	Watkins
Oldfield	Rouse	Stone	Watson
Padgett	Rubey	Stout	Weaver
Page, N. C.	Rucker	Stringer	Webb
Park	Russell	Summers	Whitacre
Patten, N. Y.	Scully	Taggart	Williams
Peterson	Seldomridge	Talcott, N. Y.	Wingo
Phelan	Shackleford	Tavener	Young, Tex.
Porter	Sherley	Taylor, Ala.	

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Frear	Kinkaid	Parker, N. Y.
Anthony	French	Knowland, J. R.	Patton, Pa.
Barchfeld	Gardner	La Follette	Peters
Barton	Gillett	Langham	Platt
Bell, Cal.	Good	Langley	Powers
Borchers	Greene, Mass.	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Britten	Greene, Vt.	Lindbergh	Rogers
Browne, Wis.	Griest	Lindquist	Scott
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLaughlin	Slemp
Butler	Haugen	Madden	Sloan
Calder	Hawley	Manahan	Smith, Idaho
Callaway	Hinds	Mann	Smith, J. M. C.
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Mapes	Smith, Minn.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hughes, W. Va.	Martin	Smith, Saml. W.
Cooper	Hullings	Miller	Stafford
Cramton	Humphrey, Wash.	Mondell	Steenerson
Curry	Johnson, Utah	Moore	Stephens, Cal.
Dies	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Dillon	Keister	Morin	Temple
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Moss, W. Va.	Thomson, Ill.
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Nelson	Towner
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Volstead
Fess	Kless, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Parker, N. J.	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Bartlett	Beall, Tex.	Carew	Difenderfer
----------	-------------	-------	-------------

NOT VOTING—96.

Ainey	Faison	Kreider	Shreve
Austin	Falconer	L'Engle	Sparkman
Avis	Fitzgerald	Lewis, Pa.	Stanley
Barnhart	Fowler	Loft	Stevens, Minn.
Bartholdt	Gard	McClellan	Stevens, N. H.
Broussard	George	McGillicuddy	Sutherland
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	McGuire, Okla.	Talbott, Md.
Burgess	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Taylor, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Metz	Thacher
Carr	Graham, Pa.	Mott	Thompson, Okla.
Cary	Green, Iowa	Nolan, J. I.	Treadway
Copley	Guernsey	O'Brien	Tuttle
Crosser	Hamill	Oglesby	Underhill
Danforth	Harris	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Davenport	Hart	Palmer	Vare
Davis	Hayes	Plumley	Walker
Dent	Helgesen	Prouty	Wallin
Drukker	Hensley	Ragsdale	Whaley
Dunn	Hobson	Reed	White
Dupré	Howell	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Hoxworth	Rupley	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Jones	Sabath	Winslow
Estopinal	Kahn	Saunders	Witherspoon
Fairchild	Kitchin	Sells	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. WHITE with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. I wish to vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. I was in the balcony.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand for a division of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his demand for a division, and the question is on the remaining part of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. PADGETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PADGETT. The title to the bill should be amended.

The SPEAKER. That comes after the passage of the bill. The question is on the passage of the bill.



Mr. MANN. And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 121, answered "present" 7, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 77.]

#### YEAS—215.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey
Adair	Dixon	Hull	Raker
Adamson	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Aiken	Doolittle	Igoe	Rayburn
Alexander	Doremus	Jacoway	Reilly, Conn.
Allen	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Reilly, Wis.
Ashbrook	Driscoll	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan
Aswell	Dupré	Keating	Rothermel
Bailey	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Rouse
Baker	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Rubey
Baltz	Estopinal	Kettner	Rucker
Barkley	Evans	Key, Ohio	Russell
Beakes	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Scully
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Konop	Seldomridge
Blackmon	Fields	Korbly	Shackelford
Booher	Finley	Lafferty	Sherley
Borland	FitzHenry	Lazaro	Sherwood
Bowdie	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Sims
Brockson	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Sisson
Brodbeck	Foster	Leshner	Small
Brown, N. Y.	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Md.
Bruckner	Francis	Levy	Smith, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Tex.
Bryan	Gallivan	Lieb	Stanley
Buchanan, Ill.	Garner	Linthicum	Stedman
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Stephens, Miss.
Bulkley	Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	George	Logue	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett	Gill	Loneragan	Stevens, N. H.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilmore	McAndrews	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Gittins	McClellan	Stout
Candler, Miss.	Glass	McKellar	Stringer
Cantor	Goeke	MacDonald	Summers
Cantrill	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Taggart
Caraway	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Carlin	Goulden	Mitchell	Tavener
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Taylor, Ala.
Casey	Gray	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Church	Gregg	Mulkey	Taylor, Colo.
Clancy	Griffin	Murdock	Ten Eyck
Claypool	Gudger	Murray	Thomas
Cline	Hamlin	Neeley, Kans.	Townsend
Coady	Hardy	Neely, W. Va.	Tribble
Collier	Harrison	O'Hair	Vaughan
Connelly, Kans.	Hay	Oldfield	Vinson
Connolly, Iowa	Hayden	Padgett	Walsh
Conry	Heflin	Palmer	Watkins
Cox	Helm	Park	Watson
Crisp	Helvering	Peterson	Weaver
Cullop	Henry	Phelan	Webb
Dale	Hill	Post	Williams
Decker	Holland	Price	Wingo
Deitrick	Houston	Quin	Young, Tex.
Dershem	Howard	Ragsdale	

#### NAYS—121.

Anderson	Gerry	La Follette	Prouty
Barchfeld	Gillett	Langham	Roberts, Mass.
Barton	Good	Langley	Rogers
Bathrick	Gordon	Lenroot	Saunders
Bell, Cal.	Greene, Mass.	Lindquist	Scott
Borchers	Greene, Vt.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Britten	Griest	McLaughlin	Slayden
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Madden	Slemp
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Manahan	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Haugen	Martin	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Hawley	Miller	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Hinds	Mondell	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Moore	Stafford
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Morgan, Okla.	Steenerson
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Morin	Stephens, Cal.
Cramton	Hulings	Morrison	Stevens, Minn.
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, Ind.	Sutherland
Dies	Johnson, Utah	Moss, W. Va.	Switzer
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Mott	Temple
Donohoe	Jones	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Drukker	Keister	Norton	Towner
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Palge, Mass.	Whitacre
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. J.	White
Fess	Kent	Parker, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Fitzgerald	Kiess, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Kinkaid	Platt	
French	Kitchin	Porter	
Gardner	Knowland, J. R.	Powers	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Beall, Tex.	Davenport	Mann	Pou
Carew	Difenderfer	Metz	

#### NOT VOTING—80.

Ainey	Cary	Faison	Hensley
Anthony	Clark, Fla.	Falconer	Hobson
Austin	Copley	Gard	Hoxworth
Avis	Crosser	Godwin, N. C.	Kahn
Barnhart	Danforth	Gorman	Kreider
Bartholdt	Davis	Graham, Pa.	L'Engle
Bartlett	Dent	Green, Iowa	Lewis, Pa.
Broussard	Doelling	Hamill	Lindbergh
Brown, W. Va.	Dunn	Harris	Loft
Burgess	Edwards	Hart	McGillcuddy
Burke, Pa.	Elder	Hayes	McGuire, Okla.
Carr	Fairchild	Helgesen	Maher

Morgan, La.	Roberts, Nev.	Thacher	Walker
Nolan, J. I.	Rupley	Thompson, Okla.	Wallin
O'Brien	Sabath	Treadway	Walters
Oglesby	Sells	Tuttle	Whaley
O'Shaunessy	Shreve	Underhill	Wilson, Fla.
Patten, N. Y.	Sparkman	Underwood	Wilson, N. Y.
Plumley	Talbott, Md.	Vare	Winslow
Reed	Taylor, N. Y.	Vollmer	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the session:

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

On the vote:

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia (for bill) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. POU (for bill) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. VOLLMER (for bill) with Mr. GREEN of Iowa (against).

Mr. HENSLEY (for bill) with Mr. FAIRCHILD (against).

Mr. J. I. NOLAN (for bill) with Mr. COPLE (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for bill) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for bill) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for bill) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. HOBSON (for bill) with Mr. DAVIS (against).

Mr. UNDERHILL (for bill) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. CARR (for bill) with Mr. SELLS (against).

Mr. METZ (for bill) with Mr. PLUMLEY (against).

Mr. RUPLEY (for bill) with Mr. HELGESEN (against).

Mr. WILSON of Florida (for bill) with Mr. WALLIN (against).

Mr. L'ENGLE (for bill) with Mr. AUSTIN (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for bill) with Mr. DAVENPORT (against).

Mr. ELDER (for bill) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. CROSSER (for bill) with Mr. WALTERS (against).

Mr. SABATH (for bill) with Mr. KREIDER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. CARY.

Mr. DENT with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who is unavoidably detained from the House. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded as answering "present."

The name of Mr. MANN was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended so as to include the words "and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CROSSER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KAHN, for three days, on account of sickness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a. m., Wednesday, February 17, 1915), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon this day.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14895) to create a new division of the Bureau of Education, to be known as the Federal motion-picture commission, and defining its powers and duties, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1411), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21465) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 21474) to provide better credit facilities and lower interest for farmers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 21475) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of a corporation for the purpose of promoting the commerce of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS: Resolution (H. Res. 738) opposing the reorganization of the Rural Mail Service by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 737) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 423) providing for the appointment of a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALCONER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging amendment of act of February 22, 1899, providing for formation of constitutions of several States, including Washington, so as to permit greater latitude of leasing public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARD: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Iowa, indorsing S. 6857, to authorize the retirement from active service with increased rank of officers now on the active list who served in the Civil War, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, requesting and urging Congress to enact a grazing homestead law similar to H. R. 15799; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 21466) granting a pension to Ellen Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21467) granting an increase of pension to Silenus A. Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 21468) granting an increase of pension to Adam E. Haughn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 21469) granting a pension to James M. Odell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21470) granting an increase of pension to Evans M. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 21471) for the relief of the estate of Mary Davis Denny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 21472) granting a pension to William E. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 21473) granting a pension to Frank D. Lukens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 21476) granting a patent to a certain strip of land to Elisha A. Crandall; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 21477) granting a pension to Lucy T. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 21478) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21479) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Hannawalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of Rincheval Post No. 572, Grand Army of the Republic, Rhineland, Mo., and other Grand Army of the Republic posts of Missouri, urging action on pensions for the Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Kingston (N. Y.) Branch of American Neutrality League, urging legislation on an embargo of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Alsace and Lorraine Mutual Relief Society, of Cincinnati, Ohio, disapproving protests against exporting food and war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 21456, for relief of John W. Warman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of citizens of Egg Harbor City, N. J., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of Col. William Wilkinson Post, No. 65, Grand Army of the Republic, Mound City, Mo.; Tarkio Post, No. 67, Grand Army of the Republic, Tarkio, Mo.; and Christian Meyer Post, No. 45, Grand Army of the Republic, Oregon, Mo., favoring House bill 15, to pension all State militia, etc., who served in Union Army for 90 days or more; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN: Petition of citizens of Washington State, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Aberdeen (S. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of 64 citizens of Beaver Dam and Reeseville and vicinity, of Dodge County, Wis., favoring an embargo on war material except foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of Indiana citizens, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Indiana citizens, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Indiana citizens, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Indiana citizens, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of 5,000 Indianapolis (Ind.) citizens, appealing for a firm administration policy in protecting American commerce on the seas with neutral countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Badger Council, No. 109, Royal League, Kenosha, Wis., favoring bill to retire aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens of Aurora, Ill., relative to embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of Stockton, Cal., and Clements County, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of State Camp of the Missouri Enrolled Militia; also sundry citizens of the sixth Missouri district, members of Posts Nos. 327, 566, 172, and 238, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 15, to pension militia-men serving in Union Army in Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Ward, S. Dak., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petitions of Thomas J. Anderson, Cleveland, Ohio; citizens of Catawba County, N. C.; Chicago and Oak Park, Ill.; Schenectady, N. Y.; and Charleston, S. C., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of Lisbon, Iowa, W. M. S., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of A. L. Ostman, protesting against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, favoring passage of House bill 15; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of C. C. E. Brandt and others, of Ironton, and W. J. Knorpp and others, of De Soto, Mo., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of citizens of Bellingham, Wash., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Hoquiam and Olympia, Wash., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Stanley Prenis, of Bristol, Conn., relative to the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.



Also, petition of Anton Fafner, of New Britain, Conn., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Memorial of Kingston (N. Y.) Branch of American Neutrality League, favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 54 citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of associated dailies of New York State, against postage-rate increase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, against legislation by Congress providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORE: Petitions of German Sunday School Society, veterans of the German Army and their sons, and sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Wilhelm Rauff, Gustav Schaun, and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON: Petitions of citizens of Hammond and Hessville, Ind., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry physicians of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Fulton County, N. Y., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of citizens of Alleene, Ark., protesting against House bills 20644 and 20780; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 17, 1915.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee helpless to meet the needs of our day and hour without Thy help. Show us how helpless we are. We seek that eternal and national freedom that can only find expression in the prayer, Thy will be done. Grant us such an enlarged vision of God's great purpose that in giving ourselves to the world we shall be giving the largest and the best service. Give us that spiritual quality that shall impart tone and uplift to all that we touch. May all our service be acceptable to God, because it is the gift of consecrated souls to their fellow men. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Gore	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bristow	Hardwick	Oliver	Stephenson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Overman	Sterling
Burleigh	Hollis	Owen	Stone
Burton	Hughes	Page	Sutherland
Camden	James	Penrose	Swanson
Catron	Johnson	Perkins	Thomas
Clapp	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pomerene	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Warren
Culberson	Lewis	Shafroth	Weeks
Cummins	Lippitt	Sheppard	White
Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
du Pont	McCumber	Simmons	Works
Fall	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of February 15, 1915, was read and approved.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL, PHILADELPHIA, PA. (S. DOC. NO. 947).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, suggesting that certain items be included in the sundry civil appropriation bill relating to the

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 948).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the sloop *Ruby*, Ezra King, master, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the municipal council of Babatngeg, Province of Leyte, P. I., praying for the passage of the so-called Jones bill, to confer self-government upon the Filipino people, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a telegram from William M. Randolph, of the Pittsburgh branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 16, 1915.

HON. GEORGE T. OLIVER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Pittsburgh branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, expressing the sentiment of the colored people of Pennsylvania, most emphatically registers its protest against the striking out of Howard University money from appropriation bill now in Senate Appropriation Committee. Our association appeals to you as a member of said committee to use your influence and exert every possible effort to have said money restored to the appropriation bill.

WM. M. RANDOLPH,  
President Pittsburgh Branch National Association  
for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. SIMMONS. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina, favoring the immediate passage of the administration ship-purchase bill. I ask that the joint resolution may be read.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read, as follows:

[Resolution No. 20.]

Joint resolution memorializing the North Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress in favor of the administration bill to secure ships for transportation.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to do all within their power to secure the immediate passage of the administration bill to secure ships for the transportation of American products to the markets of the world.

We urge prompt action by our Senators and Representatives. Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be mailed immediately to each of our Senators and each of our Representatives in Congress at Washington.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this the 16th day of February, 1915.

E. L. DAUGHTRIDGE,  
President of the Senate.  
E. R. WOOTEN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Raleigh, February 16, 1915.

I, J. Bryan Grimes, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached (one sheet) to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh this 16th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1915.

[SEAL] J. BRYAN GRIMES, Secretary of State.

Mr. CHILTON. On the same line I have received a communication from John F. McNamee, editor and manager of the Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND  
ENGINEMEN'S MAGAZINE,  
Indianapolis, Ind., February 13, 1915.

HON. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would respectfully remind you that about 3,000,000 men are out of employment in the United States and that a large pro-